AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

J. W. Peltason, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the U.S. Department of Education (NSF Contract SRS-8117037).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank J. Atelsek, *Panel Director*
Irene L. Gomberg, *Assistant Director*
Charles J. Andersen, *Senior Staff Associate*
Clare McManus, *Research Assistant*
Bernard R. Greene, *Research Analyst Programmer*
Shirley B. Kahan, *Staff Assistant*

HEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Elaine El-Khawas, *Vice President* for Policy Analysis and Research, ACE, *Chair*

Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., *President*, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States

Robert M. Rosenzweig, *President*, Association of American Universities

D. F. Finn, *Executive Vice President*, National Association of College and University Business Officers

James W. White, *Vice President* for Membership and Financial Services, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*
Stanley F. Turesky, National Endowment for the Humanities
Salvatore Corrallo, U.S. Department of Education
Charles H. Dickens, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, National Center for Education Statistics, *Chairman*
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation
Jeffrey Thomas, National Endowment for the Humanities

Additional copies of this report are available from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Student Quality in the Humanities: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials

Charles J. Andersen

Higher Education Panel Reports
Number 59 February 1984

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C. 20036

This material is based upon research supported by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Endowment for the Humanities under Contract #SRS-8117037. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring agencies.

CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments.. iv

List of Figures.. v

List of Detailed Tables.................................. vi

Highlights... ix

Background... 1

Methods Summary.. 2

Findings... 3

  Undergraduate Students................................. 3

  Applicants for Graduate Study.......................... 9

  Quality of Doctorate Recipients........................ 12

Comparison with Science and Engineering.................. 13

Conclusions.. 16

Detailed Statistical Tables.............................. 17

Appendix A: Survey Instrument............................ 31

Appendix B: Technical Notes.............................. 36

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The survey on which this report is based was developed in the Office of Program and Policy Studies at the National Endowment for the Humanities. In particular we would like to thank Arnita Jones and Stanley Turesky of that office for their comments and suggestions. Editorial services were provided by Nancy Suniewick.

The Federal Advisory Board, its Technical Advisory Committee, and ACE's HEP Advisory Committee all contributed useful guidance and suggestions during the survey process. Kathy Lyons of ACE's Division of Policy Analysis and Research provided special assistance in data processing for the graduate portion of the survey.

Most important of all, however, and deserving of our special thanks, are the Panel's campus representatives and those academic officers who provided the opinions and information which this report summarizes.

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. Opinions of the Quality Change of Undergraduate Humanities Majors over the Last Five Years............ 4

Figure 2. First-ranked Indicators of Quality Change, by Direction of Change.................................. 6

Figure 3. Direction of Quality Change by First-ranked Indicator.. 6

Figure 4. Shift of the Most Able Undergraduates Between Humanities and Other Fields, over the Last Five Years....... 7

Figure 5. Reasons for the Shift of the Most Able Students Between the Humanities and Other Fields............... 8

Figure 6. Opinions of the Quality Change of Graduate School Applicants over the Last Five Years.................... 10

Figure 7. Indicators of the Quality Change of Graduate Students.. 11

Figure 8. Comparison of 1981-82 Doctorates with 1976-77 Doctorates.. 12

Figure 9. Indicators Used to Compare 1976-77 and 1981-82 Doctorate Recipients................................. 14

LIST OF DETAILED TABLES

Page

Table 1. Opinions of Change in Quality of Undergraduate Humanities Students over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 18

Table 2. Principal Indicators of Change in Quality of Undergraduate Humanities Students over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution 19

Table 3. First-ranked Indicators of Change in Quality of Humanities Undergraduates over the Last Five Years, by Direction of Change and Type of Institution 20

Table 4. Direction of Quality Change, by First-ranked Indicators and by Type of Institution 20

Table 5. Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Students over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 21

Table 6. Reasons for Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Students Away from the Humanities over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 22

Table 7. Reasons for Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Students Toward the Humanities over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 23

Table 8. Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Student Majors Within Humanities over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 24

Table 9. Opinions of Change in Quality of Applicants for Graduate Study in Humanities Fields over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 25

Table 10. Principal Indicators of Change in Quality of Applicants for Graduate Study in Humanities Fields over the Last Five Years, by Type of Institution, 1982 26

Table 11. Principal Indicators of Change in Quality of Applicants for Graduate Study in Humanities Fields over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982 27

Table 12. Comparison of Quality of 1981-82 Humanities Doctorate Recipients with Those of 1976-77, by Control and Type of Institution 28

Page

Table 13. Principal Indicators that 1981-82 Humanities Doctorate Recipients Were Significantly Better Qualified than 1976-77 Humanities Doctorate Recipients, by Control and Type of Insitution 28

Table 14. Principal Indicators that 1976-77 Humanities Doctorate Recipients Were Significantly Better Qualified than 1981-82 Humanities Doctorate Recipients, by Control and Type of Institution 29

HIGHLIGHTS

This study sought to elicit from academic officials their opinions on the changes in the quality of humanities students. A separate study was conducted for the sciences and engineering, and its results are reported in HEP Report, No. 58, Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials.

Undergraduate Students

o Academic officers at a majority (62 percent) of the colleges and universities involved in this study reported the opinion that no significant change had occurred in the quality of the undergraduate humanities majors over the last five years. Twenty-two percent thought there had been a significant decline and 16 percent thought there had been a significant improvement. In the report for the sciences and engineering, the comparable percentages are 61 percent reporting no change, 15 percent indicating significant decline, and 25 percent noting significant improvement.

o The most important indicator on which respondents based their opinions was faculty perceptions, which made up 37 percent of the total score for all indicators. The next two important indicators were achievement test scores of entering students (26 percent) and high school grades of new students (18 percent).

o Nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of the survey population indicated their opinion that the most able entering students were shifting away from the humanities. Thirty percent of the respondents saw no shift, and five percent believed a shift toward the humanities had taken place. These figures contrast sharply with corresponding ones in the science and engineering report. That publication shows only seven percent of the respondents noting a shift away from science and engineering, 53 percent indicating no shift, and 40 percent reporting a shift toward those fields.

o The most important reasons for a shift away from the humanities, officials believed, were the perceptions of limited employment opportunities after earning a baccalaureate and after completing graduate study. Employability alone accounted for 73 percent of the total score for all reasons cited by respondents for the shift away from the humanities.

o Well over four-fifths of the respondents believed that there had been no redistribution of the most able humanities majors by field of study within the humanities over the past five years.

Applicants for Graduate Study

o Fifty-seven percent of the academic officials believed that no change had occurred in the quality of the humanities graduate school applicants over the last five years. Twenty-six percent believed that there had been a significant improvement, either overall or in a few fields, and 16 percent noted significant decline. Comparable figures from the science and engineering report were 60 percent, 28 percent, and 12 percent, respectively.

- Forty-seven percent of the respondents from the top 50 doctorate-granting institutions noted no change in the quality of graduate school applicants. Twenty-eight percent indicated that there had been improvement, whereas one-quarter believed that there had been a decline over the last five years.

- The most important indicator on which respondents based their opinion of graduate student quality change was faculty perceptions, which made up 32 percent of the total score. The second most important indicator was undergraduate grade point averages (27 percent), followed by scores on the Graduate Record Exam (21 percent).

Doctorate Recipients

- Academic officials at 72 percent of the doctorate-granting institutions in the survey believed that there was no difference in the quality of doctorate recipients in the class of 1981-82 and those in the class of 1976-77. This figure was slightly higher than that shown (66 percent) for the comparable item in the science and engineering study.

- The most important indicator upon which respondents based their opinions was change in the quality of graduate school applicants. Among the officials who believed the 1981-82 class was better, this indicator got 38 percent of the total weighted score. Among officials who believed the 1976-77 class was better, the same indicator got 53 percent of the total.

BACKGROUND

In the fall of 1982, the National Endowment for the Humanities asked the American Council on Education's Higher Education Panel (HEP) to conduct a survey to learn if, in the opinions of knowledgeable academic administrators, the quality of students in the humanities had changed in the past five years. The Panel was then in the process of undertaking a similar survey for the National Science Foundation concerning the quality of students in the sciences and engineering. It was decided that the two surveys could be conducted concurrently.[1]

The humanities questionnaires--one concerning undergraduates and one concerning graduate students--were sent to the Panel representative on each applicable campus with the request that they be completed by senior academic officers acquainted with the institution's academic atmosphere over the past five years. It was suggested that the dean of the college of arts and sciences or, at the larger institutions, the dean of the humanities division would be the appropriate respondent for the undergraduate questionnaire, and that the dean of the graduate school could best complete the graduate questionnaire. However, as always, the final decision was left to the HEP representative on each campus.

Facsimiles of both the undergraduate and graduate survey instruments are found in Appendix A. The undergraduate form went to all four-year colleges and universities in the Panel except schools of medicine, business, law, and the performing and studio arts. The graduate form was sent only to those institutions that had awarded 50 or more master's degrees in 1981. This restriction was to assure that the results would be representative of those institutions that provide most of the nation's graduate training. Thus, the estimates reported here are not unduly influenced by institutions that offer graduate training in one or two specialized fields (e.g., bible studies, theology), or whose programs at the graduate level are small and incidental to their primary mission in higher education.

---

[1] See HEP Report No. 58, Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials (Washington: American Council on Education), February 1984.

METHODS SUMMARY

The Higher Education Panel forms the basis of a continuing survey research program created in 1971 by the American Council on Education. Its purpose is to conduct surveys on topics of current policy interest to the higher education community and to government agencies.

The Panel is a disproportionate stratified sample of 760 colleges and universities drawn from the population of more than 3,000 institutions listed in the National Center for Education Statistics' Education Directory, Colleges and Universities. All institutions in the population are grouped according to the Panel's stratification design, which is based upon institution type (university, four-year college, two-year college), control (public, private), and size (full-time-equivalent enrollment). For any given survey, either the entire Panel or an appropriate subgroup is used.

The survey operation is dependent upon a network of campus representatives at the Panel institutions whose presidents have agreed to participate. The representatives receive the Panel questionnaires and direct them to the most appropriate campus officials for response.

The questionnaires were mailed in November 1982, and mail and telephone follow-ups began in December. By the January 31, 1983 close of the field phase, responses had been received from 385 of the 486 Panel institutions with undergraduate programs and 295 of the 383 colleges and universities with graduate programs, for response rates of 79 and 77 percent, respectively. Data from these institutions were statistically adjusted by computing institutional weights based upon the ratio of respondents to the number of institutions in the population, separately for each stratum. The data in this report show estimates for 1,445 institutions with undergraduate baccalaureate humanities programs and 430 institutions that awarded more than 50 master's degrees (or are Ph.D.-granting institutions) and have graduate programs in the humanities.

Appendix B presents the stratification design used to produce the national estimates and a comparison of respondents and nonrespondents, according to various institutional characteristics.

FINDINGS

It should be emphasized that this was a survey of opinion from senior academic officers, not a compilation of test scores or of grade-point averages over the past five years. It is an aggregation of the considered views and opinions of respondents who, as importantly, also were asked upon which principal indicators they based their replies. Responses to this latter question were scored as follows: the indicator ranked first in importance was multiplied by 3; the second-ranked was multiplied by 2; the third-ranked, by 1. The scores were then aggregated to arrive at the "indicator scores" whose distributions are referred to in this report.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Quality of Students. The most striking result of the survey--and the one that may cause the greatest discussion--is the degree of stability that was reported. Three-fifths (62 percent) of the institutions reported no significant change in the quality of undergraduate students majoring in the humanities over the past five years. Only about one-fifth (22 percent) reported a significant decline in quality, and one-sixth (16 percent) reported a significant improvement.

No change in the quality of humanities undergraduates was perceived by a larger proportion of private colleges and universities than of public institutions (figure 1). Within each of these sectors, doctorate-granting institutions indicated no change more frequently than nondoctorate-granting colleges.

In both the public and private sectors, more institutions indicated a decline in quality than an improvement, but the proportions were somewhat

FIGURE 1
Opinions of the Quality Change of Undergraduate Humanities Majors over the Last Five Years



Reference: Table 1

different. At private institutions, only one-fifth reported a decline, while at the public institutions, the comparable figure was over one-quarter. Among the nondoctorate group, nearly 30 percent of the public colleges reported a decline, as did one-fifth of the private colleges. This nondoctorate sector, which includes the smaller institutions, was the one that most frequently reported decline.

The HEP survey asked the people who provided these assessments on what they were based. Respondents could choose from among four indicators to rank the three that were most important in forming their opinions. By this procedure, the indicators were ranked as follows:

	Percentage of Weighted Score
Faculty perceptions	37
Achievement scores	26
High school grades/rank	18
Remedial course requirements	14
Other	5

Although the ranking of indicators overall does not differ among the institutions (see detailed table 2), distinctions emerge when first-ranked indicators are related to perceptions of change. Of those academic officials reporting either no change or a decline, 52 percent and 65 percent, respectively, ranked faculty perceptions most important. For academic officers who reported a significant improvement in quality, the indicator with the highest rating was achievement test scores, which made up 45 percent of the total. Overall, most of the respondents who reported an improvement in student quality apparently relied heavily on the more quantitative of the indicators (figure 2).

A look at these data in a slightly different light shows that respondents who chose achievement test scores or high school grades of entering students as the highest ranking indicator were least likely to say that student quality had

FIGURE 2
First-ranked Indicators of Quality Change, by Direction of Change



Reference: Table 3

FIGURE 3
Direction of Quality Change, by First-ranked Indicators



Reference: Table 4

significantly declined (11 percent and 4 percent, respectively). In contrast, respondents who cited either trends in remedial work or faculty perceptions as the most important indicator most often expressed a negative opinion about student quality (43 percent and 29 percent, respectively).

Shift Between Fields. The majority of survey participants--65 percent--indicated that over the past five years there had been a shift in the distribution of their most able students away from the humanities. Less than one-third (30 percent) reported no change, and only one out of twenty reported that the shift of the most able students had been toward the humanities.

Perceptions of a shift differ according to institutional control. The public institutions reported shifts slightly more frequently than did the pri-

FIGURE 4
Shift of the Most Able Undergraduates Between Humanities and Other Fields over the Last Five Years



Reference: Table 5

vate institutions, and the larger part of that shift was away from the humanities. Figure 4 shows a distinct difference in the perceptions of officials among the nondoctorate institutions. Almost three-quarters of those in the public sector reported a shift away from the humanities, compared with only about three-fifths of those in the private sector.

Academic officers who reported some kind of shift (either toward or away from the humanities) were asked to rank the three most important reasons for such shifts. These are shown in figure 5 according to the direction of the reported shift.

FIGURE 5
Reasons for the Shift of the Most Able Students Between the Humanities and Other Fields



Reference: Tables 6 and 7

Analysis of the responses from those who indicated a shift away from the humanities shows that employment-related reasons were the most significant. Perceptions of limited employment opportunities both after receipt of the baccalaureate and after graduate study amounted to nearly three-quarters of the aggregate scores. The reason that accounted for the next largest percentage was change in attitude towards the humanities, with one-sixth of the total.

Of those relatively few institutions that indicated a change toward the humanities, the reason ranked highest was change in attitude toward the humanities, which made up nearly two-fifths of the total. This ranking was followed by change in the variety of courses, with just under one-quarter of the score and employment opportunities after the baccalaureate with one-fifth of the score.

The most important reasons for the reported changes did not vary materially by type and control of institution (see detailed tables 6 and 7).

Shift Within the Humanities. A final set of questions concerning undergraduate quality looked at shifts over the past five years in the distribution of the most able students by field of study within the humanities.
The overwhelming majority of opinion (87 percent) was that no change had occurred (see detailed table 8). The field most frequently reported to have increased its share of students was English and American literature, but only 7 percent of the institutions indicated such a shift. Of the remaining seven humanities fields specifically identified in the survey, none garnered enough responses to make up as much as 5 percent of the total.

APPLICANTS FOR GRADUATE STUDY

Quality of Applicants. Slightly over half (57 percent) of all graduate institutions indicated that there had been no change in the quality of applicants for graduate study in the humanities in the past five years (see

detailed table 9). A little more than one-quarter indicated significant improvement, either overall (15 percent) or in a few fields (12 percent). The remaining one-sixth noted significant decline, either overall (7 percent) or in a few fields (10 percent).

Data relating to graduate school applicants were categorized separately by control (public/private), level of graduate study (whether or not the doctorate degree is awarded), and "top 50" status (whether or not the institutions were among the fifty that awarded the greatest number of doctorate degrees).

FIGURE 6
Opinions of the Quality Change of Graduate School Applicants over the Last Five Years



Reference: Table 9

As shown in figure 6, about half of the top 50 institutions reported some degree of change in the quality of their graduate student applicants in the humanities. In addition, public and private doctorate-granting institutions and private nondoctorate colleges reported similar proportions. However, just one-third of the public nondoctorate colleges indicated any change.

Significant improvement--either overall or in a few fields--was reported at more than two-fifths of the private nondoctorate institutions, but at only one-fifth of the comparable public colleges. In each of the other subsectors, the proportion indicating improvement was about one out of four.

Significant decline in applicant quality (again, either overall or in just a few fields) was reported by a quarter of the top 50--the highest proportion shown. For the other subsectors, the figures ranged from 22 percent down to 7 percent.

Among the indicators of change, the one that received the highest weighted score was faculty perceptions, which made up 31 percent of the total. The

FIGURE 7
Indicators of the Quality Change of Graduate Students



Reference: Tables 10 and 11

second highest ranking indicator was undergraduate grade-point averages (27 percent), followed by Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores (21 percent). Together, these three indicators accounted for four-fifths of the total score. Trends in the number of applications from high-quality undergraduate institutions made up 17 percent of the total, followed by 4 percent for other.

Faculty perception figured most importantly among the various kinds of institutions; however, the proportions assigned to it varied markedly. It accounted for nearly half of the total indicator score for the private nondoctorate colleges, but just over one-quarter at the public doctorate universities. The importance of the GRE scores varied significantly also; that indicator accounted for over one-quarter of the total scores for the top 50 (see detailed table 10), but only 6 percent at the private nondoctorate colleges.

QUALITY OF DOCTORATE RECIPIENTS

A final section of the questionnaire was designed to compare doctorate recipients in 1981-82 with those of five years earlier (1976-77). This

FIGURE 8
Comparison of 1981–82 Doctorates with 1976–77 Doctorates



Reference: Table 12

restricted the question to institutions that had awarded humanities doctorates in both 1976-77 and 1981-82, thereby reducing the estimated number of the institutions represented to 150.

No difference between the two classes was perceived at nearly three-quarters of the institutions. The 1981-82 class was deemed better qualified by nearly one-fifth; the earlier class was deemed superior by about one-tenth.

Two-thirds of the officials at public doctorate-granting institutions and more than three-quarters at comparable private institutions reported no change. This was also the opinion of just over three-quarters of the respondents from the top 50 institutions. Of those who did report change, the number who thought the 1981-82 class to be better qualified was twice as great as those who felt the earlier group was better. This view generally held for each sector.

Among those officials who favored the 1981-82 group, the indicator with the highest aggregate score was change in the quality of graduate school applicants, which made up 38 percent of the total. This was followed by change in the content of the doctoral program (16 percent), and in the number of new doctorates being offered tenure-track appointments in major universities (15 percent).

The highest scoring indicator among the officials who felt that the 1976-1977 doctorates were of better quality was also change in the quality of the applicants (52 percent). The other indicators' percentages are based on totals too small to have real meaning.

COMPARISON WITH SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

As noted earlier in this report, a study of the quality of students in the sciences and engineering was conducted concurrently with this survey. The

FIGURE 9
Indicators Used to Compare 1976–77 and 1981–82 Doctorate Recipients



Reference: Tables 13 and 14

results of that survey are reported in HEP No. 58, *Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering*.

One of the key findings of both studies is that over half of the institutions reported no change in the quality of their students. A second parallel relates to the most important indicator of change. In both studies, officials relied heavily on faculty perceptions in formulating their opinions.

An important difference between the studies relates to the direction of the change that was perceived. The sciences and engineering data indicate that a majority of those who reported change reported an improvement in undergraduate quality. In the humanities, the split between improvement and decline, though narrow, tilted towards decline.

Another important, and perhaps more significant, comparison between the studies concerns the shift of the most able students toward or away from their respective areas of study. As discussed earlier, the findings of this survey indicate a trend away from the humanities. In the science and engineering report, the predominant trend was toward the science and engineering fields. Overall, the opinions of academic officials suggest that the number of students shifting away from the humanities exceeded the number shifting into the sciences and engineering. This is not surprising. In fact, a one-to-one relationship would be unusual because many of the students shifting away from the humanities may very well be moving into fields such as business and commerce, education, or other fields not encompassed in the humanities, sciences, or engineering.

The most significant factor behind the reported shift away from the humanities and toward the science and engineering fields was the perception of employment opportunities after completion of study. The two reports thus appear to be generally consistent with one another in both the direction of the movement of able students and the reason for the changes.

The humanities data more closely parallel those of science and engineering in the graduate area. In both studies, about three-fifths of the institutions reported no change in the quality of graduate school applicants. Of those institutions that indicated change, most noted an improvement, either across-the-board or in a few fields.

In both studies, a strong majority indicated that they perceived no difference in quality between doctorate recipients of 1976-77 and 1981-82. Of those that did perceive change, in both studies, the majority held that the more recent recipients were better qualified.

CONCLUSIONS

At about the same time that this HEP survey was being answered by senior academic officers throughout the country, several national commissions were preparing reports that strongly criticized the quality of education in America. Those documents, which indicate the existence of an education crisis, seem to conflict with the findings of this HEP survey which show that, in the opinion of hundreds of academic administrators, there has been little change in quality of humanities majors in American colleges and universities in recent years. This HEP report may be seized upon by some as a refutation of the gloomier aspects of the national commissions' studies. However, the data presented herein should not be stretched farther than they can reach. They relate to only a recent five-year period, and they refer to significant change as perceived by officials at four-year colleges and universities.

What may be more troubling than the amount of change--or lack thereof--in the humanities is the belief by many officials that to some extent high-ability students have shifted away from the humanities. Not surprisingly, the most strongly expressed reason for this change relates to employment opportunities after the completion of studies.

Finally, there appears to be no drastic change in perceptions about the quality of doctorate recipients in the past five years, a relatively short period for change in graduation education--in fact, less than one Ph.D. generation in a number of fields. That more of the officials who noted change perceived it as improvement instead of decline may provide a basis for optimism.

Detailed Statistical Tables

Note: In the following tables, detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Table 1

Opinions of Change in Quality of Undergraduate Humanities Students over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

Change in Quality of Undergraduates	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
Total estimate (N)	(1,445)	(219)	(1,226)	(456)	(134)	(322)	(989)	(85)	(904)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No significant change	61.8	65.5	61.1	52.7	59.0	50.2	66.0	75.7	65.0
Significant improvement	15.9	15.5	16.0	20.1	18.4	20.8	14.0	10.9	14.3
Significant decline	22.3	19.0	22.0	27.2	22.6	29.0	20.1	13.4	20.7

Table 2

Principal Indicators of Change in Quality of Undergraduate Humanities Students over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Indicator	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
(Total score)	(7,711)	(1,198)	(6,513)	(2,417)	(743)	(1,674)	(5,294)	(455)	(4,839)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Faculty perceptions	36.9	35.9	37.1	36.9	36.9	37.1	37.0	34.9	37.2
Achievement test scores	26.1	30.4	25.3	26.8	30.1	25.4	25.8	30.9	25.3
High school grades/rank	18.3	17.8	18.4	17.7	17.5	17.8	18.6	18.5	18.6
Remedial work in composition	13.9	11.8	14.2	15.3	11.3	17.1	13.2	12.7	13.2
Other	4.8	4.0	4.9	3.2	4.6	2.7	5.6	3.1	5.8
RANK ORDER									
Faculty perceptions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Achievement test Scores	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
High school grades/rank	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Remedial work in composition	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Other	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 3

First-ranked Indicators of Change in Quality of Humanities Undergraduates over the Last Five Years, by Direction of Change and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

First-ranked Quality Indicator	All Institutions			Doctorate-granting Institutions			Nondoctorate-granting Institutions		
	No Significant Change	Significant Improvement	Significant Decline	No Significant Change	Significant Improvement	Significant Decline	No Significant Change	Significant Improvement	Significant Decline
Total estimate (N)	(893)	(230)	(322)	(143)	(34)	(42)	(750)	(196)	(280)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Faculty perceptions	52.1	24.4	64.6	49.0	50.0	57.9	52.6	20.3	65.5
Achievement test scores	21.1	44.8	11.0	34.9	29.4	15.2	18.4	47.2	10.4
High school grades/rank	15.9	13.0	2.4	12.2	11.8	2.4	16.6	13.2	2.4
Remedial work in composition	6.7	12.6	20.8	3.9	0.0	15.3	7.3	14.7	21.7
Other	4.2	5.2	1.2	0.0	8.8	9.2	5.1	4.6	0.0

NOTE: Shown here are distributions of the single indicator ranked highest by each respondent. These percentages will differ from those in other tables that show distributions of the indicator scores.

Table 4

Direction of Quality Change, by First-ranked Indicators and by Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Type of Institution and Direction of Quality of Change	First-ranked Indicators			
	Faculty Perceptions	Trends in Achievement Scores	Trends in High School Grades/Rank	Trends in Remedial Work in Composition
All institutions (N)	(729)	(326)	(180)	(156)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No significant change	63.0	57.0	78.4	37.7
Significant improvement	7.9	32.0	17.2	19.0
Significant decline	29.1	11.0	4.4	43.3
Doctorate-granting institutions (N)	(112)	(66)	(22)	(12)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No significant change	63.2	75.8	77.3	50.0
Significant improvement	15.1	15.2	18.2	0.0
Significant decline	21.7	9.0	4.5	50.0
Nondoctorate-granting institutions (N)	(617)	(260)	(158)	(144)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No significant change	63.0	52.3	78.5	36.9
Significant improvement	6.6	36.2	17.1	20.6
Significant decline	30.4	11.5	4.4	42.5

Table 5

Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Students over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

Kind of Shift	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
Total estimate (N)	(1,445)	(219)	(1,226)	(456)	(134)	(322)	(989)	(85)	(904)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No change	29.5	27.8	29.8	25.3	26.5	24.8	31.4	29.9	31.5
Shift toward humanities	5.3	5.3	5.3	2.3	6.7	0.5	6.6	3.0	7.0
Shift away from humanities	65.3	66.9	65.0	72.4	66.8	74.7	62.0	67.1	61.5

Table 6

Reasons for Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Students
Away from the Humanities over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

Reasons for Shift Away from Humanities	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
(Total score)	(5,308)	(836)	(4,472)	(1,909)	(515)	(1,394)	(3,399)	(321)	(3,078)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employment after bachelor's	51.4	49.6	51.7	50.3	49.8	50.5	52.0	49.2	52.3
Employment after graduate study	21.3	26.4	20.4	24.7	26.1	24.2	19.4	26.8	18.6
Change in attitude toward humanities	16.4	14.8	16.7	16.6	15.9	16.8	16.3	12.9	16.6
Change in variety of course offerings	5.1	1.4	5.8	2.3	1.3	2.6	6.7	1.6	7.2
Opportunities for graduate study	3.0	5.2	2.6	2.9	4.5	2.2	3.0	6.4	2.7
Change in perception of student aid availability	1.3	1.7	1.2	2.0	1.0	2.4	0.9	2.7	0.7
Other	1.6	1.0	1.7	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.8	0.4	1.9
RANK ORDER									
Employment after bachelor's	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Employment after graduate study	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Change in attitude toward humanities	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Change in variety of course offerings	4	6	4	5	5	4	4	6	4
Opportunities for graduate study	5	4	5	4	4	6	5	4	5
Other	6	7	6	7	5	7	6	7	6
Change in perception of student aid availability	7	5	7	6	7	5	7	5	7

Table 7

Reasons for Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Students Toward the Humanities over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

Reasons for Shift Toward Humanities	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
(Total score)	(411)	(52)	(359)	(44)	(37)	(7)	(367)	(15)	(352)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Change in attitude toward humanities	38.5	33.2	39.3	30.6	36.7	0.0	39.5	25.0	40.1
Change in variety of course offerings	22.7	5.2	25.2	6.1	7.3	0.0	24.7	0.0	25.8
Employment after baccalaureate	21.1	22.2	20.9	15.5	10.6	40.0	21.8	50.0	20.5
Opportunities for graduate study	9.3	7.4	9.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.4	25.0	9.8
Employment after graduate study	4.9	4.5	5.0	15.3	6.4	60.0	3.7	0.0	3.8
Change in perception of student aid availability	0.9	6.8	0.0	8.0	9.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2.6	20.7	0.0	24.5	29.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
RANK ORDER									
Change in attitude toward humanities	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	1
Change in variety of course offerings	2	6	2	6	5	-	2	-	2
Employment after baccalaureate	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	1	3
Opportunities for graduate study	4	4	4	-	-	-	4	2	4
Employment after graduate study	5	7	5	4	6	1	5	-	5
Other	6	3	-	2	2	-	-	-	-
Change in perception of student aid availability	7	5	-	5	4	-	-	-	-

Table 8

Shift in Distribution of the Most Able Undergraduate Student Majors Within the Humanities over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

Kind of Shift and Field of Study	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
Total estimate (N)	(1,445)	(219)	(1,226)	(456)	(134)	(322)	(989)	(85)	(904)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No change	86.9	83.1	87.6	87.9	82.9	90.0	86.4	83.3	86.7
English and American literature	7.3	6.6	7.4	3.9	8.9	1.9	8.8	3.0	9.4
Religious studies	2.5	1.6	2.7	0.5	1.6	0.0	3.4	1.5	3.6
Foreign languages and literature, modern and classical	2.4	7.5	1.6	4.2	8.3	2.5	1.6	6.1	1.2
Philosophy	2.4	2.3	2.4	1.7	2.8	1.2	2.8	1.5	2.9
History, criticism and theory of arts	1.5	1.8	1.4	0.3	1.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	1.9
History	1.0	3.5	0.5	1.3	2.8	0.7	0.8	4.6	0.5
American studies	0.4	1.6	0.2	1.0	1.6	0.7	0.1	1.5	0.0
Archaeology	0.3	0.5	0.3	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	5.5	8.1	5.0	8.8	8.4	9.0	3.9	7.6	3.6

Note: Percentages are not addable. Institutions were permitted to identify as many as three fields that had the greatest increase in the share of the most able students.

Table 9

Opinions of Change in Quality of Applicants for Graduate Study in Humanities Fields over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

	All Institutions					Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
		Doctorate-granting									
Degree of Change	Total	All	Top 50	All Other	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
Total estimate (N)	(430)	(206)	(50)	(156)	(224)	(294)	(133)	(161)	(136)	(73)	(63)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No significant change	57.3	52.7	47.4	54.5	61.5	59.8	51.7	66.5	52.1	54.6	49.1
Significant improvement overall	14.7	10.6	2.8	13.1	18.5	11.2	11.3	11.2	22.2	9.3	37.1
Significant improvement in a few fields	11.7	16.3	25.3	13.4	7.5	12.3	17.8	7.8	10.5	13.7	6.9
Significant decline overall	6.6	7.8	9.1	7.4	5.5	6.7	8.7	5.0	6.5	6.2	6.9
Significant decline in a few fields	9.6	12.6	15.4	11.6	6.9	10.0	10.6	9.6	8.6	16.2	0.0

Table 10

Principal Indicators of Change in Quality of Applicants for Graduate Study in Humanities Fields over the Last Five Years, by Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

Indicators of Change in Quality	All Institutions		Doctorate-granting Institutions						Nondoctorate-granting Institutions	
			All		Top 50		Others			
	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent
(Total score)		(2,344)		(1,156)		(286)		(870)		(1,188)
Total	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0
Faculty perceptions	1	31.5	1	28.5	1	32.6	1	27.2	1	34.3
Undergraduate grade-point average	2	26.7	3	21.9	4	14.5	3	24.3	2	31.3
Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores	3	20.8	2	25.6	2	28.0	2	24.8	3	16.2
Applications from graduates of high-quality undergraduate institutions	4	17.2	4	20.4	3	22.3	4	19.8	4	14.0
Other	5	3.9	5	3.6	5	2.6	5	3.9	5	4.1

Table 11

Principal Indicators of Change in Quality of Applicants for Graduate Study in Humanities Fields over the Last Five Years, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982

(In percentages)

	All Institutions			Public Institutions			Private Institutions		
Indicator	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting	Total	Doctorate-granting	Nondoctorate-granting
(Total score)	(2,344)	(1,156)	(1,188)	(1,615)	(755)	(860)	(729)	(401)	(328)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Faculty perceptions	31.5	28.5	34.3	28.8	27.6	29.9	37.3	30.2	46.0
Undergraduate grade-point average	26.7	21.9	31.3	28.9	23.2	33.9	21.8	19.5	24.5
Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores	20.8	25.6	16.2	22.7	25.8	19.9	16.8	25.1	6.5
Applications from graduates of high-quality undergraduate institutions	17.2	20.4	14.0	14.9	19.2	11.1	22.2	22.7	21.6
Other	3.9	3.6	4.1	4.7	4.2	5.1	2.0	2.5	1.3
RANK ORDER									
Faculty perceptions	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Undergraduate grade-point average	2	3	2	1	3	1	3	4	2
Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores	3	2	3	3	2	3	4	2	4
Applications from graduates of high-quality undergraduate institutions	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	3
Other	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 12

Comparison of Quality of 1981-82 Humanities Doctorate Recipients with Those of 1976-77, by Control and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Quality Comparison	Doctorate-granting Institutions Total	Public	Private	Top 50	All Others
Total estimate (N)	(150)	(95)	(55)	(50)	(100)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No significant difference in quality	71.7	67.7	78.7	76.0	69.0
1981-82 group is significantly better qualified	19.4	22.7	13.9	16.0	22.0
1976-77 group was significantly better qualified	8.8	9.7	7.4	8.0	9.0

Table 13

Principal Indicators that 1981-82 Humanities Doctorate Recipients Were Significantly Better Qualified than 1976-77 Humanities Doctorate Recipients, by Control and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Principal Indicators of Quality	Total		Public		Private		Top 50		All Others	
	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent
(Total score)	(156)		(120)		(36)		(44)		(112)	
Total	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0
Change in quality of graduate school applicants	1	37.5	1	36.7	1	38.9	1	36.4	1	37.5
Change in content of doctoral program	2	15.6	4	15.8	2	13.9	2	22.7	3	13.4
Change in number of new doctorates being offered tenure-track appointments in major universities	3	15.2	2	16.4	3	11.1	-	0.0	2	21.4
Change in level of research support	5	9.4	5	9.2	3	11.1	5	9.1	5	9.8
Change in number of new doctorates who held nationally competitive awards for graduate study	6	6.1	6	5.7	6	8.3	4	11.4	6	3.6
Change in number of new doctorates being offered employment in business and industry	7	2.6	-	0.0	3	11.1	-	0.0	6	3.6
Other	4	13.5	3	16.1	7	5.6	3	20.5	4	10.7

Table 14

Principal Indicators that 1976-77 Humanities Doctorate Recipients Were Significantly Better Qualified than 1981-82 Humanities Doctorate Recipients, by Control and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Principal Indicators of Quality	Total		Public		Private		Top 50		All Others	
	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent
(Total score)	(68)		(48)		(20)		(23)		(45)	
Total	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0
Change in quality of graduate school applicants	1	52.9	1	50.0	1	60.0	1	56.5	1	51.1
Change in number of new doctorates who held nationally competitive awards for graduate study	2	16.2	2	16.7	3	15.0	2	30.4	4	8.9
Change in number of new doctorates being offered tenure-track appointments in major universities	3	11.8	5	8.3	2	20.0	-	0.0	2	17.8
Change in content of doctoral program	4	8.8	3	12.5	-	0.0	-	0.0	3	13.3
Change in level of research support	5	7.4	4	10.4	-	0.0	3	13.0	5	4.4
Change in number of new doctorates being offered employment in business and industry	6	1.5	-	0.0	4	5.0	-	0.0	6	2.2
Other	6	1.5	6	2.1	-	0.0	-	0.0	6	2.2

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

November 12, 1982

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
(202) 833-4757

Dear Higher Education Panel Representative:

Attached are Higher Education Panel Surveys, Numbers 58 and 59, "Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering" and "Student Quality in the Humanities," respectively. The former is sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the latter, by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Each seeks the opinion of knowledgeable academic officials on the quality of students--both undergraduate and graduate--in the academic areas indicated.

Anecdotal information from department heads, deans, and faculty suggest that there may be quality changes in today's science, engineering, and humanities students compared with those of a decade ago. In order to be better able to decide what action, if any, is appropriate, the Foundation and the Endowment wish to learn more about the nature of these perceptions and how widespread they are.

Each questionnaire has two parts--one for undergraduates, the other for graduate students. The undergraduate section may be most appropriately completed by the dean of undergraduate instruction at larger institutions or by the dean of the college at smaller institutions; we recommend that the graduate sections be completed by the graduate dean. As usual, however, we rely on your determination of the most appropriate respondent.

Please understand that your institution's response will be protected to the maximum extent permissible by law. As with all our surveys, the data you provide will be reported in summary fashion only and will not be identifiable with your institution. This survey is authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

Please ask the person whose opinions will be reflected on the questionnaires to return them to us by November 29, enclosed in the postpaid preaddressed envelope.

If you have any problems or questions, please do not hesitate to telephone us collect at (202)833-4757. Thank you, once again, for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Atelsek

Frank J. Atelsek
Panel Director

Enclosures

AMERICAN
COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION

Higher Education Panel Survey No. 59

OBM No. 3145-0009
Exp. 6/30/84

STUDENT QUALITY
IN THE
HUMANITIES

NOTE

This survey is designed to elicit the opinions of senior academic officers at the undergraduate and graduate levels concerning the quality of students in the humanities. Please bear in mind that we seek your judgment and impressions, not "hard" institutional data. There are two parts to this questionnaire. One (blue) requests opinions concerning undergraduates; the other (gray) requests opinions concerning graduate students. Some of you may have received only one questionnaire, others may have received both. Please follow the appropriate instructions, and return the completed questionnaire(s) to the American Council on Education.

Fields of Humanities

This listing of disciplines is illustrative rather than exhaustive.

English and American literature
Foreign languages and literature, modern and classical
History
American studies
Philosophy
Archaeology
Religious studies
History, criticism, and theory of the arts

PART I—UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

The following questions are designed to elicit your *opinion or judgment* of the quality of undergraduate students who are majoring in the humanities fields. If your institution has *no undergraduates majoring in humanities*, please check here ☐, provide the information requested at the end of this form, and return it to the American Council on Education.

1. In your opinion, how has the quality of students who major in humanities fields at your institution changed over the past 5 years?

1.1 ____ There has been *no* significant *change*.
1.2 ____ There has been a significant *improvement* in the quality of humanities students.
1.3 ____ There has been a significant *decline* in the quality of humanities students.

2. What are the principal *indicators* upon which you base your opinion? Please *rank order the three most important indicators* (1 = most important, etc.).

2.1 ____ Trends in achievement test scores of entering students.
2.2 ____ Trends in high school grades or high school class rank of entering students.
2.3 ____ Trends in requirements for remedial courses in composition.
2.4 ____ Faculty perceptions.
2.5 ____ Other; specify. ________________________________
2.6 ____ Other; specify. ________________________________

3. In your opinion, over the past 5 years has there been a shift in the distribution of your most able students between the humanities and other fields?

3.1 ____ No. (Go to question 5.)
3.2 ____ Yes, *toward* the humanities. } (Go to question 4.)
3.3 ____ Yes, *away from* the humanities. }

4. If you answered "yes" to question 3, what, in your opinion, are the most important reasons for the shift in the distribution of your most able students? Please *rank order the three most important reasons* (1 = most important, etc.).

4.1 ____ Change in perception of employment opportunities following receipt of the baccalaureate.
4.2 ____ Change in perception of opportunities for employment following graduate or professional training.
4.3 ____ Change in perception of opportunities for admission to graduate or professional school.
4.4 ____ Change in attitude toward the humanities.
4.5 ____ Change in the variety of course offerings at this institution.
4.6 ____ Change in perception of availability of student financial aid for undergraduate study.
4.7 ____ Other; specify. ____________________
4.8 ____ Other; specify. ____________________

5. Of those students with humanities majors, in your opinion, has there been a shift in the distribution of your most able students by field *within* the *humanities* over the past 5 years.

5.1 ____ No. (Please complete the section at the end of this form and return it to A.C.E.)
5.2 ____ Yes. (Go to question 6.)

6. If you answered "yes" to question 5, please indicate in the blanks below the three humanities fields that have had the *greatest increase in the share* of your most able students. (Refer to the list of fields on page 1.)

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this form by **November 29, 1982** to:

Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Please keep a copy of this form for your records.
Person completing the form:

Name ____________________
Title ____________________
Telephone ____________________

If you have any questions or problems concerning this survey, please call HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757.

AMERICAN
COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION

Higher Education Panel Survey No. 59

OBM No. 3145-0009
Exp. 6/30/84

STUDENT QUALITY
IN THE
HUMANITIES

NOTE

This survey is designed to elicit the opinions of senior academic officers at the undergraduate and graduate levels concerning the quality of students in the humanities. Please bear in mind that we seek your judgment and impressions, not "hard" institutional data. There are two parts to this questionnaire. One (blue) requests opinions concerning undergraduates; the other (gray) requests opinions concerning graduate students. Some of you may have received only one questionnaire, others may have received both. Please follow the appropriate instructions, and return the completed questionnaire(s) to the American Council on Education.

Fields of the Humanities

This listing of disciplines is illustrative rather than exhaustive.

English and American literature
Foreign languages and literature, modern and classical
History
American studies
Philosophy
Archaeology
Religious studies
History, criticism, and theory of the arts

PART II—GRADUATE STUDENTS

The following questions are designed to elicit your *opinion or judgment* concerning aspects of the quality of incoming graduate students and recipients of doctoral degrees in the humanities. If your institution has *no graduate students working toward advanced degrees in the humanities*, please check here ☐ and return the questionnaire to the American Council on Education.

1. In your opinion, how has the quality of applicants for graduate study in the humanities at your institution changed over the past 5 years? Please select the *single* most appropriate response below.

1.1 ____ There has been *no* significant *change*.

1.2 ____ There has been a significant *improvement* in the quality of humanities applicants *overall*.

1.3 ____ There has been a significant *improvement* in the quality of humanities applicants in a *few fields*.

1.4 ____ There has been a significant *decline* in the quality of humanities applicants *overall*.

1.5 ____ There has been a significant *decline* in the quality of humanities applicants in a *few fields*.

2. What are the principal *indicators* upon which you base your judgment? Please *rank order the three most important indicators* (1 = most important, etc.).

2.1 ____ Trends in Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores.

2.2 ____ Trends in undergraduate grade point averages.

2.3 ____ Trends in number of applications received from graduates of high quality undergraduate institutions.

2.4 ____ Faculty perceptions.

2.5 ____ Other; specify. ____________________

2.6 ____ Other; specify. ____________________

3. Did your institution award any doctorates in the humanities fields in 1981–82?

3.1 ____ Yes. (Go to question 4.)

3.2 ____ No. (Please provide the information requested at the end of the form and return it to the American Council on Education.)

4. If you checked "yes" to question 3, in your opinion, how do the 1981–82 humanities doctorate recipients from your institution compare with those of 5 years earlier? If your institution had no doctorate recipients in 1976–77, please check here ☐ and return the form to the American Council on Education.

4.1 ____ No significant difference in quality.

4.2 ____ The 1981–82 group is significantly better qualified.

4.3 ____ The 1976–77 group was significantly better qualified.

5. If you checked either 4.2 or 4.3, what were the principal indicators upon which you base your judgment? Please *rank order the three most important indicators* (1 = most important, etc.).

5.1 ____ Change in the quality of graduate school applicants.

5.2 ____ Change in the number of new doctorates from this institution who held nationally competitive awards for graduate study.

5.3 ____ Change in content of the doctoral programs at this institution.

5.4 ____ Change in the number of new doctorates from this institution being offered tenure-track appointments in major universities.

5.5 ____ Change in the number of new doctorates from this institution seeking employment in business and industry.

5.6 ____ Change in the level of research support at this institution.

5.7 ____ Other; specify. ________________________________

5.8 ____ Other; specify ________________________________

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this form by **November 29, 1982** to:

Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Please keep a copy of this form for your records.
Person completing the form:

Name ________________________

Title ________________________

Telephone ________________________

If you have any questions or problems concerning this survey, please call HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757.

APPENDIX B: TECHNICAL NOTES

Weighting

For this survey two questionnaires were developed: one for institutions with undergraduate students majoring in the humanities; the other, for institutions with graduate students working toward advanced degrees in the humanities. Excluded were independent law, medical, and business schools; theological seminaries; schools of performing arts and other professional institutions.

The undergraduate questionnaires were sent to four-year colleges and universities that awarded the baccalaureate and were members of the Panel. Table B-1 shows the institutional population, the number of respondents to the undergraduate questionnaire for each stratum, and those that reported humani-

Table B-1

Stratification Design
(Undergraduate Questionnaire)

Cell	Type of Institution	Population	Respondents Total	Respondents with Humanities
	Total	1,744	385	360
01	Public universities	112	87	85
02	Private universities	74	53	51
04	Public black four-year colleges FTE 3,000+	13	7	6
05	Public nonblack four-year colleges FTE 8,750+	106	73	70
07	Private four-year colleges FTE 8,750+	13	7	5
09	Public four-year colleges FTE 3,700 - 8,750	76	34	34
10	Public four-year colleges FTE <3,700	186	26	23
11	Private four-year colleges FTE 2,000 - 8,750	126	30	30
12	Private four-year colleges FTE 1,000 - 1,999	264	38	35
13	Private four-year colleges FTE <1,000	774	30	21

ties majors. The 385 respondents represented 79 percent of the institutions to which the questionnaires were sent. Twenty-five of the respondents indicated that they did not have undergraduates majoring in the humanities.

The graduate questionnaire was sent to institutions that awarded master's degrees or doctorates, but in order to have the survey results reflect the opinions of those officials at institutions that account for the lion's share of the graduate education effort, tabulations include only data from institutions that awarded 50 master's degrees or more in 1981. Table B-2 shows that 295 institutions returned graduate questionnaires. This represents 77 percent of the Panel institutions to which this questionnaire was mailed. Fifty-three respondents were not included in the tabulations because they either did not

Table B-2

Stratification Design
(Graduate Questionnaire)

Cell	Type of Institution	Population	Respondents Total	Respondents with Humanities*
	Total	657	295	242
01	Public universities	112	88	85
02	Private universities	74	51	44
04	Public black four-year colleges FTE 3,000+	12	7	5
05	Public nonblack four-year colleges FTE 8,750+	98	69	60
07	Private four-year colleges FTE 8,750+	12	7	5
09	Public four-year colleges FTE 3,700 - 8,750	70	33	27
10	Public four-year colleges FTE <3,700	81	13	6
11	Private four-year colleges FTE 2,000 - 8,750	84	19	9
12	Private four-year colleges FTE 1,000 - 1,999	56	2	1
13	Private four-year colleges FTE <1,000	58	6	0

*Included here are doctorate-granting institutions and institutions that awarded 50 or more master's degrees in 1980-81.

have graduate programs in the humanities or had awarded fewer than 50 master's degrees.

The weighting technique used was the standard one employed for Panel surveys. Data received from Panel members were adjusted for item and institutional nonresponse within each cell. Then institutional weights were applied to bring Panel data up to estimates representative of the national population.

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Table B-3 compares the undergraduate survey respondents and nonrespondents against several variables. Higher-than-average response rates were recorded

Table B-3

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents:
Undergraduate Student Questionnaire

(In percentages)

Institutional Characteristics	Respondents (N=385)	Nonrespondents (N=101)	Response Rate
Total	100.0	100.0	79.2
Control			
Public	59.0	61.4	78.5
Private	41.0	38.6	80.2
Type and control			
Public doctorate-granting	27.6	27.7	79.1
Private doctorate-granting	15.3	20.8	73.8
Public nondoctorate-granting	31.4	33.7	78.1
Private nondoctorate-granting	25.7	17.8	84.6
Region			
East	26.3	31.7	75.9
Midwest	31.4	27.7	81.2
South	27.5	18.8	84.8
West	14.8	21.8	72.2
Total undergraduate full-time-equivalent enrollment (1976)			
Less than 1,000	12.7	9.9	83.1
1,000 - 4,999	37.4	30.7	82.3
5,000 and above	49.9	59.4	76.2

for private, nondoctorate-granting institutions, colleges and universities in the South, and for institutions with full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollments of less than 5,000 undergraduates. Lower-than-average response rates were shown by private doctorate-granting universities, institutions in the East and the West, and institutions enrolling more than 5,000 FTE undergraduates.

Table B-4 compares the graduate survey respondents and nonrespondents against the same variables. Higher-than-average response rates were recorded for public doctorate-granting institutions and institutions in the Midwest and

Table B-4

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents: Graduate Student Questionnaire

(In percentages)

Institutional Characteristics	Respondents (N=295)	Nonrespondents (N=88))	Response Rate
Total	100.0	100.0	77.0
Control			
Public	71.2	61.4	79.5
Private	28.8	38.6	71.4
Type and control			
Public doctorate-granting	36.3	30.7	79.9
Private doctorate-granting	19.3	26.1	71.3
Public nondoctorate-granting	34.9	30.7	79.2
Private nondoctorate-granting	9.5	12.5	71.8
Region			
East	24.4	33.0	71.3
Midwest	32.5	26.1	80.7
South	27.5	15.9	85.3
West	15.6	25.0	67.6
Total undergraduate full-time-equivalent enrollment (1976)			
Less than 1,000	2.7	5.7	61.5
1,000 - 4,999	30.8	27.3	79.1
5,000 and above	66.4	67.0	76.9

the South. Lower-than-average response rates were shown by the private sector, by small colleges (FTE of less than 1,000 students), and by institutions in the East and the West.

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Student Assistance: Participants and Programs, 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 27, July, 1975.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Health Research Facilities: A Survey of Doctorate-Granting Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 28, February, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Faculty Research: Level of Activity and Choice of Area.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 29, January, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctorate Faculty in Selected Science and Engineering Departments, 1975 to 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 30, August, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Energy Costs and Energy Conservation Programs in Colleges and Universities: 1972-73 and 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 31, April, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Foreign Area Research Support Within Organized Research Centers at Selected Universities, FY 1972 and 1976.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 32, December, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **College and University Services for Older Adults.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 33, February, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Production of Doctorates in the Biosciences, 1975-1980: An Experimental Forecast.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 34, November, 1977.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Composition of College and University Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 35, August, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 36, September, 1977.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **International Scientific Activities at Selected Institutions, 1975-76 and 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 37, January, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **New Full-Time Faculty 1976-77: Hiring Patterns by Field and Educational Attainment.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 38, March, 1978.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Nontenure-Track Science Personnel: Opportunities for Independent Research.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 39, September, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Scientific and Technical Cooperation with Developing Countries, 1977-78.** Higher Education Panel, Report No. 40, August, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Special Programs for Female and Minority Graduate Students.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 41, November, 1978.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **The Institutional Share of Undergraduate Financial Assistance, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 42, May, 1979.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctoral Faculty in Science and Engineering: Trends in Composition and Research Activity.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 43, February 1979.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Shared Use of Scientific Equipment at Colleges and Universities, Fall 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 44, November, 1979.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Newly Qualified Elementary and Secondary School Teachers, 1977-78 and 1978-79.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 45, February, 1980.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Refund Policies and Practices of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 46, February, 1980.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Expenditures for Scientific Research Equipment at Ph.D.-Granting Institutions, FY 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 47, March, 1980.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Tenure Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 48, July, 1980.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Trends in Financial Indicators of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 49, April, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **An Analysis of Travel by Academic Scientists and Engineers to International Scientific Meetings in 1979-80.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 50, February, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 51, August, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Recruitment and Retention of Full-Time Engineering Faculty, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 52, October, 1981.

Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Sabbatical and Research Leaves in Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 53, February, 1982.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Andersen, Charles J. **Undergraduate Student Credit Hours in Science, Engineering, and the Humanities, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 54, June, 1982.

Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **An Assessment of College Student Housing and Physical Plant.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 55, October, 1982.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Financial Support for the Humanities: A Special Methodological Report.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 56, January, 1983.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Neuroscience Personnel and Training.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 57, June, 1983.

Atelsek, Frank J. **Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials.** Higher Education Report No. 58, February, 1984.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

J. W. Peltason, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, The National Endowment for the Humanities, and the U.S. Department of Education (NSF Contract SRS-8117037).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank J. Atelsek, *Panel Director*
Irene L. Gomberg, *Assistant Director*
Charles J. Andersen, *Senior Staff Associate*
Clare McManus, *Research Assistant*
Bernard R. Greene, *Research Analyst Programmer*
Shirley B. Kahan, *Staff Assistant*

HEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Elaine El-Khawas, *Vice President* for Policy Analysis and Research, ACE, *Chair*
Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., *President*, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States
Robert M. Rosenzweig, *President*, Association of American Universities
D. F. Finn, *Executive Vice President*, National Association of College and University Business Officers
Connie Sutton, *Vice President* for Professional Services, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*
Armen Tashdinian, National Endowment for the Humanities
Salvatore Corrallo, U.S. Department of Education
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, National Center for Education Statistics, *Chairman*
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation
Jeffrey Thomas, National Endowment for the Humanities

Additional copies of this report are available from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

A1410-1.16

Financial Aid for Full-time Undergraduates

Charles J. Andersen

Higher Education Panel Reports
Number 60 April 1984

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C. 20036

This material is based upon research supported by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Endowment for the Humanities under contract with the National Science Foundation (#SRS-8117037). Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring agencies.

CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements iv

List of Figures v

List of Text Tables v

List of Detailed Tables vi

Highlights viii

Introduction 1

Methods Summary 1

Findings 1

- Dependent Students 5
- Independent Students 6
- Student Aid and Enrollment 6
- Student Aid Packages 6
- Changes in Freshman Packages 9
- Changes in Upper Division Packages 10
- Data Processing and Student Aid 10
- Standards for Determining Satisfactory Academic Progress 13

Summary 13

Detailed Statistical Tables 15

Appendix A: Survey Instrument 28

Appendix B: Technical Notes 33

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was developed by Salvatore Corrallo of the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education. The Federal Advisory Board, its Technical Advisory Committee, and the American Council on Education's Higher Education Panel Advisory Committee all contributed guidance and suggestions during the survey process. Bernard Greene, ACE Division of Policy Analysis and Research, directed the data processing activity for this survey. Editorial services were provided by Nancy Suniewick.

We wish to thank A. Dallas Martin, Jr. and Dennis J. Martin of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators for their advice and counsel.

As ever, our special thanks go to the Panel's campus representatives and those academic officials who provided the information for this report.

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates Who Received Student Aid, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 2

Figure 2. Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates Who Received Student Aid, by Average Freshman Budget Range, Fall 1982 3

Figure 3. Percentage of Undergraduate Student Aid Funded by Federal Programs, by Control and Type of Institution, 1982-83 3

Figure 4. Percentage of Undergraduate Student Aid Funded by Federal Programs, by Average Freshman Budget Range, 1982-83 4

Figure 5. Families of *Dependent* Undergraduates Receiving Aid, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 4

Figure 6. Families of *Dependent* Undergraduates Receiving Aid, by Income Level and Average Freshman Budget Range, Fall 1982 5

Figure 7. Families of *Independent* Undergraduates Receiving Aid, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 7

Figure 8. Sources of Funds for Typical Freshman Aid Packages 8

Figure 9. Sources of Funds for Typical Freshman Aid Packages, by Control of Institution 8

Figure 10. Sources of Funds for Freshman Aid Packages, by Budget Ranges 9

Figure 11. Sources of Funds for Freshman Aid Packages, by Control of Institution (In Dollars) 11

Figure 12. Sources of Funds for Freshman Aid Packages, by Budget Ranges (In Dollars) 11

Figure 13. Percentage of Institutions That Do Not Use Computers for Student Aid Administration, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 12

Figure 14. Percentage of Institutions That Use Computers for Student Aid Administration, by Function, Fall 1982 12

LIST OF TEXT TABLES

Page

Table A. Financial Aid Provided to Full-time Undergraduates and Percentage from Federal Programs 2

Table B. Percentage of Federally Aided Full-time Undergraduates Who Are Independent 6

Table C. Distribution of Institutions by Percentage of Federally Aided Independent Undergraduates, by Control of Institution 6

Table D. Reasons for Enrollment Shortfall, by Control of Institution 6

Table E. Sources of Funds for Typical Freshman Student Aid Packages 7

Table F. Differences in the Composition of Freshman Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution 10

Table G. Differences in the Compostion of Upper Division Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution 10

LIST OF DETAILED TABLES

Page

Table 1. Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates Who Received Student Financial Aid, By Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 15

Table 2. Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates Who Received Student Financial Aid, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 15

Table 3. Amount of Student Aid and Percentage from Federal Programs, by Control and Type of Institution, 1981-82 and 1982-83 15

Table 4. Amount of Student Aid and Percentage from Federal Programs, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, 1981-82 and 1982-83 15

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982, Dependent Students 16

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982, Dependent Students 16

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982, Independent Students 17

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982, Independent Students 17

Table 9. Percentage of Undergraduate Federal Student Aid Recipients Classified as Independent Students, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 18

Table 10. Distribution of Institutions, by Percentage of Independent Federally Aided Undergraduates, and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 18

Table 11. Institutions with Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment Shortfall, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 19

Table 12. Selected Reasons for Enrollment Shortfall, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 19

Table 13. Composition of Freshman Student Aid Packages and Average Student Expense Budgets, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 20

Table 14. Composition of Sophomore Student Aid Packages and Average Student Expense Budgets, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 20

Table 15. Composition of Upper Division Student Aid Packages and Average Student Expense Budgets, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 20

Table 16. Average Expense Budget and Percentage Distribution of Student Aid Packages for Freshmen, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 21

Table 17. Average Expense Budget and Percentage Distribution of Student Aid Packages for Sophomores, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 21

Table 18. Average Expense Budget and Percentage Distribution of Student Aid Packages for Upper Classmen, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 21

Table 19. Estimated Average Full-time Freshman Expense Budget, by Source of Funds and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 22

Table 20. Estimated Average Full-time Sophomore Expense Budget, by Source of Funds and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 22

Table 21. Estimated Average Full-time Upper Division Expense Budget, by Source of Funds and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 22

Table 22. Estimated Average Freshman Expense Budget, by Source and Support and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 23

Page

Table 23. Estimated Average Sophomore Expense Budget, by Source of Support and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 23

Table 24. Estimated Average Upper Division Expense Budget, by Source of Support and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982 23

Table 25. Differences in the Composition of Freshman Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution 24

Table 26. Differences in the Composition of Upper Division Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution 24

Table 27. Differences in the Composition of Freshman Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges 25

Table 28. Differences in the Composition of Upper Division Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges 25

Table 29. Percentage of Institutions That Use Computers for Student Aid Administration, by Function and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982 26

Table 30. Bases for Satisfactory Progress Standards for Federal Student Aid Eligibility 26

HIGHLIGHTS

- Nationally, 51 percent of full-time undergraduates received some form of financial aid through their higher education institutions in 1982. This percentage varied widely depending on the institutions' type and control. Forty-one percent of the undergraduates at public two-year colleges were aided, compared with sixty-five percent of those at private four-year colleges.
- Forty-six percent of the students attending less costly institutions (where costs are less than $3,000 per year) received aid, compared with 59 percent of the students who attended the more expensive colleges and universities.
- In 1982-83, the total amount of aid distributed was $7.7 billion, up slightly from the previous year when it was $7.6 billion. Fifty-four percent went to students attending public institutions; the remainder went to students at private colleges and universities. These figures exclude funds from Guaranteed Student Loans and from the social security and veterans' benefits programs.
- Federal programs funded more than half of the aid distributed in 1981-82 and in 1982-83.
- Two-fifths (40 percent) of dependent aided students came from families with annual incomes under $15,000. Slightly more than one-fifth (22 percent) came from families with incomes of $30,000 or more. These percentages varied depending on the institutions' control, type, and cost of attendance. For example, nearly sixty percent of aided dependent students at public two-year institutions were from families with incomes of less than $15,000, whereas only seven percent came from families in the upper ($30,000 or more) income range.
- Nationally, one out of four (27 percent) federally aided undergraduates was classified as financially independent of family support. At public institutions, 33 percent of the students receiving federal student aid are independent. At private institutions, the comparable figure is 16 percent.
- About one-quarter (27 percent) of all institutions reported lower enrollment in 1982-83 than expected. Forty-four percent attributed this shortfall in part to economic conditions. One-third noted that reduced student aid was a factor in the shortfall and one-third noted that the uncertainty about student aid availability in the spring of 1982 was a factor.
- Grants and scholarships constitute just over a third of the typical student aid "package" for freshmen. Student employment accounts for 13 percent, loans for one-fifth. Family contributions and savings account for the remaining 29 percent of the typical freshman package.
- The average annual freshman expense budget—what it costs freshmen to attend college—at private institutions was nearly double the budget at public institutions.
- Two-thirds of the public institutions and 52 percent of the private institutions reported that the composition of the typical freshman financial aid packages had not been changed between 1981-82 and 1982-83. At institutions where the packages had been changed, the alteration generally was an increase in work or loans or both to meet the student expense budget. This picture is roughly the same for aid packages for upper division students.
- About three-quarters of all institutions use computers for some aspect of student aid administration. The two functions that appeared to be most widely automated are student billing and keeping records of the students' academic progress.
- The two sources used widely by institutions to determine academic progress standards for continued eligibility for federal student aid are recommendations of an institutional committee and self-regulation guides published by the American Council on Education, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

INTRODUCTION

This survey was sponsored by the Department of Education as a means of gathering specific data that would describe the level and composition of student financial aid for undergraduates. It provides estimates for the number of undergraduates who received aid, the total amount they received, the distribution of the aided students by their families' income level, the composition of their aid packages, and the use of computers in the administration of the aid. In addition, information is provided on the sources used by the institutions in developing their standards for eligibility for continued student support from federal aid programs.

Student financial aid as used in this report is restricted to that provided to full-time undergraduates and includes grants and scholarships, institutionally arranged student employment, and loans. In the discussion of "aid packages", a fourth item has been included: "other sources (student's savings, summer earnings, etc.; student's family's contributions, etc.)." Its inclusion rounds out the picture of the typical aided student's resources.

METHODS SUMMARY

The Higher Education Panel is a continuing survey research program created in 1971 by the American Council on Education to conduct specialized surveys on topics of current policy interest both to the higher education community and to government agencies.

The Panel is a disproportionate stratified sample of 760 colleges and universities drawn from the population of more than 3,000 institutions listed in the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) *Education Directory, Colleges and Universities.* All institutions in the population are grouped according to the Panel's stratification design, which is based on three factors: institution type (whether the institution is a university, four-year college, or two-year college), control or governance (whether it is public or private), and size (as measured by full-time-equivalent enrollment). For any given survey, either the entire Panel or an appropriate subgroup is used.

The survey instrument for this study was mailed in January 1983 to all Panel institutions with undergraduate programs. By the May 6 close of the field phase, after mail and telephone follow-ups, usable data had been received from 557 institutions, for a response rate of 80 percent. Data from responding institutions were statistically adjusted to represent the national population of 2,801 colleges and universities that provide financial assistance to their undergraduate students. Institutional weights were computed separately for each stratum, based on the ratio of the number of institutions in the population to the number of institutions that responded.

A question that required special processing to provide meaningful national and sectoral estimates was the one that dealt with the distribution of aided students by the income level of their families. The pretest results indicated that most institutions would be able to provide such data only on a percentage distribution basis; they did not have actual student counts categorized in this manner. Because averaging the percentages was inappropriate, it was necessary to first estimate the *numbers* of families for each income level and then recalculate the percentage distributions. To do this, full-time undergraduate enrollment data for each institution were multiplied by a proxy for the dependent/independent student distribution at the institution. This estimate was then multiplied by the percentage distribution of families according to income range and by the appropriate institutional weight. The results were then aggregated by institutional classification (type and control) and income range and then converted back into the percentage distributions shown in this report. The proxy used for the dependent/independent split was the percentage of students receiving *federal* aid who were independent, a figure that was requested in the questionnaire.

Appendix B presents the stratification design used to produce the national estimates and a comparison of respondents and nonrespondents according to various institutional characteristics.

FINDINGS

Half of the full-time undergraduates enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities (51 percent) received some form of student financial aid administered by their institutions in the fall term of 1982 (figure 1).

Within the public sector, only two-fifths (41 percent) of the students at two-year institutions were aided as compared with half the students at the four-year colleges and 48 percent at the universities. At the private universities, the figure was just over half (54 percent), and at the private four-year colleges it was nearly two out of three. The striking 70 percent shown for the private two-year colleges must be viewed with caution. That figure is based on very high institutional weights and a lower-than-average response rate. Thus, the margin for error is potentially large. Data for the private four-year colleges and universities are much more reliable.

FIGURE 1
Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates
Who Received Student Aid, by Control and Type of Institution,
Fall 1982



Reference: Table 1

TABLE A—Financial Aid Provided to Full-time Undergraduates and Percentage from Federal Programs

Type of Institution	Total Amount (in billions) 1981-82	Total Amount (in billions) 1982-83	1981-82 Percentage of Total	1981-82 Percentage from Federal Programs	1982-83 Percentage of Total	1982-83 Percentage from Federal Programs
All institutions	$7.6	$7.7	100	55	100	53
Public	4.2	4.2	55	63	54	62
Private	3.4	3.5	45	44	46	42

Reference: Table 3

When institutions are categorized by what it costs, on the average, for freshmen to attend (that is, by the freshman expense budget), those institutions with budgets of less than $6,000 reported that just under half of their students received aid (figure 2). Those institutions with budgets of $6,000 or more indicated that three out of five of their undergraduates received aid.

The total amount of aid distributed was nearly $7.7 billion in academic year 1982-83, and slightly less ($7.6 billion) in the previous year.* A little more than half of the 1982-83 amount ($4.2 billion or 54 percent) went to students at public institutions; the remainder went to students at private colleges and universities. In the previous year, the public/private split was essentially the same—55 percent public and 45 percent private (table A).

Federal programs provided more than half of these funds in both years. In 1982-83, the figure was 53 percent. In the previous year, the figure was 55 percent. But these are national averages. They blur distinctions due to differences in the type and control of the institutions. In 1982-83, for example, 71 percent of the funds at public two-year institutions came from federal sources. At the other end of the scale, only 39 percent of the funds distributed by the private universities were federal (figure 3).

---

*These dollar amounts cover all assistance delivered to the student through the institution, including institutional and governmental (federal, state and local) student aid such as the Pell grant, National Direct Student Loans, College Work-Study, and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants. Excluded, however, were Guaranteed Student Loans, veterans' benefits, and social security assistance.

FIGURE 2
Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates
Who Received Student Aid, by Average Freshman Budget Range,
Fall 1982



Reference: Table 2

FIGURE 3
Percentage of Undergraduate Student Aid
Funded by Federal Programs, by Control and Type of Institution,
1982-83



Reference: Table 3

FIGURE 4
Percentage of Undergraduate Student Aid Funded by Federal Programs, by Average Freshman Budget Range, 1982-83



Reference: Table 4

FIGURE 5
Families of *Dependent* Undergraduates Receiving Aid, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 5

When institutions are classed by their freshman expense budgets, the proportion of federal support is greatest at the low end of the budget spectrum. Three-quarters of the support awarded at institutions with expense budgets of less than $3,000 per year came from the federal government. In contrast, only about two-fifths of the support at the most expensive institutions came from Washington (figure 4).

When these percentages are applied to the total amount of student aid, they show that just over $4 billion came from federal undergraduate student aid programs that are administered through the institutions.

Family Income of Dependent Aided Undergraduates

About two out of five of the *dependent aided* full-time students came from families with annual incomes of less than $15,000. Slightly more than one-third (38 percent) came from families in the $15,000-$29,999 range, and the remaining fifth (22 percent) were from families with even higher incomes (figure 5).

Major differences in income distribution appear when these data are classified by type and control of institution. At the public two-year community colleges, nearly three-fifths of the dependent aided full-time undergraduates were from families with incomes of less than $15,000. Less than 10 percent of the dependent aided students at this type of institution came from families with incomes in excess of $30,000. At private universities, however, only one-quarter of the aided full-time dependent undergraduates came from families with incomes of less than $15,000, while two out of five were from families in the top income category. At public four-year colleges, nearly half of the dependent aided students were from families with under $15,000 annual income; slightly over one-third (37 percent) were in the $15,000-$29,999 range, and only about one in seven were from the most affluent group.

An analysis of the institutions' annual freshman expense budgets supports this picture. The least expensive institutions reported that high proportions of their dependent aided students were from the lower family income ranges. The most expensive institutions show high proportions of dependent aided students from families in the high range (figure 6). Nearly three-quarters of the dependent aided students at institutions with the lowest expense budgets (less than $3,000) came from families with incomes less than $15,000. Just three-quarters of the dependent aided students at the institutions costing $7,500 or more came from families with incomes of $15,000 and up.

FIGURE 6
Families of *Dependent* Undergraduates Receiving Aid, by Income Level and Average Freshman Budget Range, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 6

Family Income of Independent Aided Undergraduates

Three-quarters of the *independent aided* undergraduates who received aid were from families with incomes of less than $7,500. Only one percent were reported to have incomes of $30,000 or more. The differences shown in the distribution of the families of dependent aided undergraduates were not evident in the distribution of the independent aided undergraduates (figure 7). When the data are categorized by control and type of institution, in no case does the proportion of independent aided students in the lowest income range (less than $7,500) fall below two-thirds, nor does the share in the $30,000 or more range exceed three percent.

When the data were categorized by the size of the institutions' freshman expense budgets, the distributions continued to show considerable uniformity. Three out of four of the independent aided undergraduates at the low budget institutions were in families with incomes of less than $7,500. At the most expensive colleges, four out of five fell into that income range, and less than two percent were in the top income class.

Percentage of Federally Aided Students Who Are Independent

Nationally, one out of four federally aided undergraduates was independent. This figure varies widely according to institutional control. At public institutions, the figure was one out of three; in the private sector, it was one out of six (table B).

TABLE B—Percentage of Federally Aided Full-time Undergraduates Who Are Independent

Control and Type of Institution	Percent
All institutions	27
Public institutions	33
Universities	28
Four-year colleges	29
Two-year colleges	45
Private institutions	16
Universities	10
Four-year colleges	17
Two-year colleges	19

Reference: Table 9

TABLE C—Distribution of Institutions by Percentage of Federally Aided Independent Undergraduates and by Control of Institution

Percentage of Federally Aided Undergraduates Who Are Independent	All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Total	100%	100%	100%
Less than 20%	46	18	73
20 – 39%	28	38	18
40% or more	26	44	9

Reference: Table 10

Nearly three-quarters of the private institutions reported that less than one-fifth of their federally aided students were classified as independent, while only 18 percent of the public institutions fell into that range. Conversely, 44 percent of the public institutions reported that two-fifths or more of their federally aided undergraduates were independent. This contrasts with the nine percent of the private institutions so reporting (table C).

Student Aid and Enrollment

About one-quarter of all institutions reported a shortfall in enrollment below 1982 projections. One-fifth of the public institutions reported fewer students than expected; one-third of the private institutions did.

Two-fifths of the institutions with enrollment shortfalls attributed them—at least in part—to economic conditions (table D). One-third (35 percent) indicated that reduced student aid was a factor, and the same percentage gave as a reason the *uncertainty* about student aid that was present in the spring of 1982. The high cost of college attendance was cited by one-quarter of the reporting institutions in the private sector as a reason for lower enrollment, but by only 8 percent in the public.

TABLE D—Reasons for Enrollment Shortfall, by Control of Institution
(In percentages)

Reason for Enrollment Shortfall	All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Economic conditions	44	38	47
Reduced student aid	35	21	42
Uncertainty about availability of student aid	35	25	40
High cost of attendance	20	8	26
Demographic factors	12	9	14

Note: Percentages will not sum to 100 because multiple responses were permitted.

Reference: Table 12

Student Aid Packages

Four sources of funds were identified as components of the student aid packages for freshmen, sophomores, and upper division undergraduates: scholarships and grants; student employment; loans; and other sources. The other sources included family contributions and savings, summer earnings, etc. This latter component is usually *not* included in the standard definition of a "financial aid package". However, it was made a part of this questionnaire's definition of a "typical student aid package" (see appendix A) in order to get data concerning the provenance of *all* of the resources used for the year's education by aided students.

Institutions also reported the average student expense budget for each of the class levels. The budgets included tuition and fees; room and board charges, if appropriate; books and supplies; transportation; and other expenses. This was basically the same budget definition used by the major student aid agencies.

Grants and scholarships accounted for a little more than one-third of the typical aided freshman's student aid pack-

FIGURE 7

Families of *Independent* Undergraduates Receiving Aid, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 7

age. Student employment accounted for one-eighth, loans for one-fifth, and "other sources" for about three-tenths (figure 8). Only minor variations appeared when the control of the institutions is considered; the largest difference appeared in student employment. At public institutions, it provided nearly one-fifth of the aided students' support; at private institutions, it accounts for only ten percent figure 9). Figure 9 also shows that a relatively high proportion of student support at private institutions comes from students' own resources and families; 31 percent versus 24 percent at public institutions.

More variation in student aid packages appears within each control sector when the institutions are further classed by type (table E). Aided full-time freshmen at public two-year colleges receive nearly three-fifths (59 percent) of their assistance from grants and scholarships and employment. Their counterparts at public universities received half of their support from those sources.

TABLE E—Sources of Funds for Typical Freshman Student Aid Packages

(In percentages)

	Universities		Four-year Colleges		Two-year Colleges	
Source of Funds	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Grants and Scholarships	33	37	37	36	39	36
Student Employment	17	9	17	10	20	9
Loans	23	20	21	23	18	27
Other sources	27	34	25	31	24	30

Reference: Table 13

FIGURE 8
Sources of Funds for Typical Freshman Aid Packages



Reference: Table 13

FIGURE 9
Sources of Funds for Typical Freshman Aid Packages, by Control of Institution



Reference: Table 13

In the private sector, the principal difference in student aid packages appears in the proportion that loans provide. At universities, they account for 20 percent of the package; at two-year institutions, they make up 27 percent of the total. Again, this latter figure should be used with caution because of the high institutional weight and poor response in this sector.

No great variations appear when the data are distributed by class level. Detailed tables 13-15 show that the percentage distributions differ by only one or two percentage points.

When institutions are classed by the size of their student expense budgets, sizable variations appear. Figure 10 contrasts data from the least expensive institutions category (less than $3,000) with those from the costliest ($7,500 or more). At the least expensive institutions, over half of the typical student aid package came from grants and scholarships; one-fifth came from employment; and one-fifth came from student or family resources. Less than ten percent came from loans. At institutions in the most expensive budget range, however, one-third of the aid package came from grants and scholarships, only one-tenth came from employment, but one-third came from the student and family resources, and one-fifth came from loans.

Translation of these percentage distributions into dollars provides sharp contrasts. Because the average freshman budget in the private sector was nearly double that in the public, seemingly small differences in percentage distributions turned into dollar amounts that, for the private institutions, were frequently much larger than the amounts shown for the public institutions (figure 11). Even more striking are comparisons based on expense budget ranges (figure 12). The typical amount borrowed at the most expensive institutions is more than ten times the amount borrowed at the least expensive. The amount provided by other sources (i.e., student savings, summer earnings, family contributions, etc.) was five times greater at the expensive institutions than at the inexpensive ones.

Changes in Freshman Packages from 1981-82 to 1982-83

Two-thirds of the public institutions and just over half of the private ones indicated no changes had been introduced into the typical freshman financial aid packages between academic years 1981-82 and 1982-83. Within the public sector, three out of four of the two-year institutions reported no change. Among the universities and four-year colleges, the proportion was closer to one out of two. Among the private institutions, seven-eighths of the two-year institutions, half of the four-year colleges, and about one-third of the universities reported no change (table F).

In those cases where there was some change, it more frequently than not involved an increased amount of work

FIGURE 10
Sources of Funds for Freshman Aid Packages, by Budget Ranges



Reference: Table 16

TABLE F—Differences in the Composition of Freshman Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Difference	Universities		Four-year Colleges		Two-year Colleges	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
No change	55	30	58	46	73	86
More work and/or loans in 1982-83	29	43	25	48	15	7
More grants and scholarships in 1982-83	5	35	7	13	10	0
More support from other sources in 1982-83	10	10	9	6	8	7
Other changes	10	5	11	11	6	0

Reference: Table 25

TABLE G—Differences in the Composition of Upper Division Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83 by Control and Type of Institution

(In percentages)

Difference	Universities		Four-year Colleges	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
No change	51	42	57	50
More work and/or loans in 1982-83	34	45	27	49
More grants and scholarships in 1982-83	4	27	5	8
More support from other sources in 1982-83	9	8	9	5
Other changes	10	3	11	7

Reference: Table 26

and/or loans. Nearly half of the private four-year colleges reported such change, as did one-quarter of the public universities and four-year colleges. An increase in scholarships and grants was reported by relatively few institutions—only eleven percent overall. However, one-third of the private universities indicated such increases.

Changes in Upper Division Packages

A little more than half of the respondents reported no change in the aid packages for upper division students. As in the case of the freshman packages, most of the change involved increases in the work and/or loan portion of the package, with a large proportion (nearly half) of the private four-year institutions reporting such increases (table G). Increases in grants and scholarships were reported by one-quarter of the private universities, the only institutional category where that kind of change exceeded 10 percent.

Data Processing and Student Aid

Nearly one-quarter of the institutions indicated that they did *not* use computers for any aspect of student aid administration. However, this percentage was unevenly distributed among the various institutional types. Less than two percent of the universities were estimated to have no computer application for student aid. (Even this may be an overestimation. In one instance, a university indicated that it happened to be "between systems," and that the new system was not yet operational.) The public four-year colleges also showed a very high degree of automation. Figure 13 shows the percentage of institutions that reported *no* computer usage. The complementary percentage represents the proportion of institutions that used computers for some aspect of student aid administration.

Two functions appeared to be automated most widely: student billing and academic progress record-keeping (figure 14). Slightly more than half of the institutions reported using computers for each of these activities. Approximately one-third of the institutions used computers for disbursing grants and for collecting loans, while one-quarter reported computer use in processing applications, disbursing loans, and reporting to funders. Nationally, only one out of seven institutions used computers to determine the amount of a student's financial aid award. However, that proportion varied widely according to institutional type. Over half of the public universities used computers for that funciton, whereas less than ten percent of the public two-year colleges did. With few exceptions, each of the specific functions listed on the questionnaire showed computer application by more than half of the universities—public and private—and by public four-year colleges. In sum, computer use for the administration of student aid, though widespread, is not universal.

FIGURE 11
Sources of Funds for Freshman Aid Packages, by Control of Institution



Reference: Table 19

FIGURE 12
Sources of Funds for Freshman Aid Packages, by Budget Ranges



Reference: Table 22

FIGURE 13
Percentage of Institutions That Do Not Use Computers for Student Aid Administration, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 29

FIGURE 14
Percentage of Institutions That Use Computers for Student Aid Administration, by Function, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 29

Standards for Determining Satisfactory Progress

A provision of the Higher Education Amendments of 1976 required that recipients of federal financial aid must show satisfactory academic progress in order to be eligible for the continuation of such assistance. The law did not stipulate what satisfactory academic progress was; instead, it left that definition up to each institution. Various higher education associations have tried to help institutions define such progress by identifying guidelines for establishing standards. Some states have developed regulations for their public institutions. However, because higher education is so diverse, no specific set of rules has yet been promulgated for national application.

This survey asked institutions about the *sources* of the academic progress standards they had adopted. Four specific sources were listed:

- State requirements
- Accrediting association recommendations
- Self-regulation guidelines jointly issued by the American Council on Education, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
- Recommendations of an institutional committee.

In addition, an "other" option was included. Multiple responses were permitted.

Two sources stood out as those used by most institutions: recommendations of an institutional committee and the self-regulation guidelines. Each was used by from half to three-quarters of the institutions, depending on control or type (table 30). State requirements were listed by one-quarter to one-third of the respondents.

SUMMARY

In the fall of 1982, student financial aid in the form of scholarships and grants, institutionally arranged student employment, and loans (excluding Guaranteed Student Loans) was provided to half of the full-time undergraduates in the nation's colleges and universities. This assistance amounted to $7.7 billion, of which federal funds accounted for roughly half.

Of those aided undergraduates who were classified as dependent on their families for support, two-fifths came from families with annual incomes under $15,000. Of the undergraduates classified as "independent", three-quarters had annual family incomes of less than $7,500.

The "typical package" for aided undergraduates can be described as coming from three sources in generally equal proportions: (1) scholarships and grants; (2) student employment and loans (including Guaranteed Student Loans); (3) the student's and his/her family's own resources.

The foregoing indicates the general magnitude and characteristics of undergraduate student aid summarized nationally. But aid programs at individual institutions vary widely. The following tables give some indication of the extent of that variety.

DETAILED TABLES

TABLE 1—Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates Who Received Student Financial Aid, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

Control and Type of Institution	Number of Institutions	Percentage of Undergraduates with Student Aid
All institutions	2,801	50.8
Public institutions	1,383	46.4
Universities	111	47.5
Four-year colleges	373	50.1
Two-year colleges	899	41.2
Private institutions	1,418	63.1
Universities	71	54.1
Four-year colleges	1,104	65.1
Two-year colleges	243	70.0

TABLE 2—Percentage of Full-time Undergraduates Who Received Student Financial Aid, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

Freshman Expense Budget Ranges	Number of Institutions	Percentage of Undergraduates with Student Aid
All institutions	2,801	50.8
Institutions with freshman expense budget of:		
Less than $3,000	200	46.5
$3,000-$4,499	905	48.3
$4,500-$5,999	578	46.4
$6,000-$7,499	539	61.9
$7,500 or more	579	59.1

TABLE 3—Amount of Student Aid and Percentage from Federal Programs, by Control and Type of Institution, 1981-82 and 1982-83

	1981-82		1982-83	
Control and Type of Institution	Total Amount of Student Aid (in millions)	Percentage from Federal Programs	Total Amount of Student Aid (in millions)	Percentage from Federal Programs
All institutions	$7,592.6	54.5	$7,669.5	52.7
Public institutions	4,176.9	63.3	4,156.4	62.1
Universities	1,567.4	52.1	1,534.3	50.8
Four-year colleges	1,605.0	69.0	1,591.0	67.2
Two-year colleges	1,004.6	71.6	1,031.0	71.1
Private institutions	3,415.6	43.7	3,513.1	41.6
Universities	879.9	40.9	908.6	39.3
Four-year colleges	2,299.6	43.7	2,357.5	41.5
Two-year colleges	236.1	53.1	247.1	51.3

TABLE 4—Amount of Student Aid and Percentage from Federal Programs, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, 1981-82 and 1982-83

	1981-82		1982-83	
Freshman Expense Budget Ranges	Total Amount of Student Aid (in millions)	Percentage from Federal Programs	Total Amount of Student Aid (in millions)	Percentage from Federal Programs
All institutions	$7,592.6	54.5	$7,669.5	52.7
Institutions with freshman expense budget of:				
Less than $3,000	237.7	76.4	242.6	75.3
$3,000-$4,499	2,290.3	67.5	2,280.3	65.9
$4,500-$5,999	1,789.5	56.1	1,789.4	56.0
$6,000-$7,499	1,056.1	49.2	1,068.5	46.2
$7,500 or more	2,218.8	39.9	2,288.7	37.8

TABLE 5—Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

Dependent Students

Control and Type of Institution	Percentage of Families with Income of: Less Than $7,500	$7,500-$14,999	$15,000-$29,999	$30,000 or More	All Income Levels
All institutions	18.1	21.8	37.8	22.3	100%
Public institutions	22.4	24.9	37.2	15.5	100
Universities	16.5	20.4	40.3	22.8	100
Four-year colleges	23.4	26.2	36.6	13.8	100
Two-year colleges	29.8	29.6	33.3	7.3	100
Private institutions	11.1	16.8	38.9	33.2	100
Universities	10.0	14.3	35.6	40.1	100
Four-year colleges	11.2	17.2	39.2	32.4	100
Two-year colleges	13.1	18.6	44.4	23.9	100

TABLE 6—Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

Dependent Students

Freshman Expense Budget Range	Percentage of Families with Income of: Less Than $7,500	$7,500-$14,999	$15,000-$29,999	$30,000 or More	All Income Levels
All institutions	18.1	21.8	37.8	22.3	100%
Institutions with freshman expense budget of:					
Less than $3,000	35.2	36.4	24.0	4.5	100
$3,000-$4,499	24.7	26.0	36.2	13.1	100
$4,500-$5,999	17.4	22.2	40.1	20.3	100
$6,000-$7,499	11.7	16.6	43.6	28.1	100
$7,500 or more	9.6	15.4	36.6	38.5	100

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 7—Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

Independent Students

	Percentage of Families with Income of:				
Control and Type of Institution	Less Than $7,500	$7,500-$14,999	$15,000-$29,999	$30,000 or More	All Income Levels
All institutions	75.4	17.5	5.7	1.3	100%
Public institutions	77.0	16.9	5.0	1.1	100
Universities	82.3	11.8	4.2	1.6	100
Four-year colleges	78.0	16.3	4.8	0.9	100
Two-year colleges	72.4	21.1	5.7	0.8	100
Private institutions	68.4	20.3	9.0	2.3	100
Universities	77.3	14.8	6.3	1.6	100
Four-year colleges	66.7	20.9	9.8	2.6	100
Two-year colleges	70.5	22.4	6.1	1.0	100

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 8—Percentage Distribution of Aid Recipients' Families, by Income Level and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

Independent Students

	Percentage of Families with Income of:				
Freshman Expense Budget Ranges	Less Than $7,500	$7,500-$14,999	$15,000-$29,999	$30,000 or More	All Income Levels
All institutions	75.4	17.5	5.7	1.3	100%
Institutions with freshman expense budget of:					
Less than $3,000	74.7	20.8	3.9	.6	100
$3,000-$4,499	75.1	18.4	5.2	1.4	100
$4,500-$5,999	75.9	16.6	6.2	1.3	100
$6,000-$7,499	71.2	18.6	8.7	1.5	100
$7,500 or more	80.1	13.1	5.2	1.6	100

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 9—Percentage of Undergraduate Federal Student Aid Recipients Classified as Independent Students, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

Control and Type of Institution	Percentage of Undergraduate Federal Student Aid Recipients
All institutions	27.3
Public institutions	33.0
Universities	27.8
Four-year colleges	28.5
Two-year colleges	44.7
Private institutions	15.8
Universities	10.4
Four-year colleges	16.7
Two-year colleges	19.2

Note: The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 10—Distribution of Institutions, by Percentage of Independent Federally Aided Undergraduates and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

Control and Type of Institution	Number of Institutions	All Percentage Ranges	Percentage of Federally Aided Independent Undergraduates					
			Less than 10%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-59%	60% or more
All institutions	2,801	100.0	20.2	25.7	13.3	14.6	15.6	10.6
Public institutions	1,383	100.0	3.8	14.5	16.6	21.7	27.0	16.4
Universities	111	100.0	3.1	28.1	24.0	25.0	15.6	4.2
Four-year colleges	373	100.0	6.1	22.4	29.1	18.2	20.3	3.9
Two-year colleges	899	100.0	3.0	9.5	10.4	22.7	31.3	23.1
Private institutions	1,418	100.0	36.3	36.5	10.2	7.7	4.3	5.0
Universities	71	100.0	45.0	40.0	10.0	3.3	1.7	0.0
Four-year colleges	1,104	100.0	34.2	36.6	12.4	4.9	5.5	6.4
Two-year colleges	243	100.0	42.9	35.7	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0

TABLE 11—Institutions with Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment Shortfall, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

(In percentages)

Item	All Institutions	Public				Private			
		Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges	Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges
Institutions without enrollment shortfall	72.8	81.0	89.6	78.1	81.2	64.9	71.7	64.6	64.3
Institutions with enrollment shortfall	27.2	19.0	10.4	21.9	18.8	35.1	28.3	35.4	35.7

TABLE 12—Selected Reasons for Enrollment Shortfall, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

Reason for Shortfall	All Institutions	Public				Private			
		Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges	Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges
Number of institutions experiencing shortfall (N)	(760)	(262)	(12)	(81)	(169)	(498)	(20)	(391)	(87)
Percentage of institutions experiencing shortfall that attributed it to:									
Economic conditions	43.9	37.8	50.0	33.3	39.1	47.2	25.0	49.9	40.2
Reduced student aid	34.6	20.6	25.0	24.7	18.3	42.0	25.0	47.8	19.5
Uncertainty about availability of student aid	34.6	24.8	8.3	23.5	26.6	39.8	40.0	39.6	40.2
Demographic factors	12.0	8.8	8.3	24.7	1.2	13.7	55.0	5.6	40.2
High cost of attendance	20.0	8.4	16.7	7.4	8.3	26.1	35.0	27.1	19.5
Admissions factors (change in requirements, reorganization, etc.)	17.1	5.0	8.3	8.6	3.0	23.5	5.0	29.7	0.0
Academic factors (change in calendar, programs, etc.)	10.3	16.8	8.3	8.6	21.3	6.8	5.0	8.4	0.0
Geographic factors	1.2	1.5	8.3	3.7	0.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	0.0
Other	8.8	10.7	8.3	7.4	12.4	7.8	20.0	4.6	19.5
No reason indicated	8.2	15.3	8.3	14.8	16.0	4.4	5.0	5.4	0.0

Note: Percentages will sum to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

TABLE 13—Composition of Freshman Student Aid Packages and Average Student Expense Budgets, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

	Percentage of Typical Student Aid Package from:					
Control and Type of Institution	Grants and Scholarships	Student Employment	Loans[1]	Other Sources[2]	Total	Average Expense Budget (In dollars)
All institutions	36.6	12.8	21.7	28.9	100.0	5,654
Public institutions	37.8	18.6	19.2	24.4	100.0	3,868
Universities	32.7	16.9	23.3	27.0	100.0	4,804
Four-year colleges	37.1	17.3	20.7	24.8	100.0	4,141
Two-year colleges	39.0	19.5	17.8	23.7	100.0	3,639
Private institutions	36.0	9.8	23.1	31.2	100.0	7,395
Universities	37.1	8.9	19.7	34.3	100.0	10,204
Four-year colleges	35.9	10.2	22.7	31.2	100.0	7,428
Two-year colleges	36.1	8.0	26.6	29.3	100.0	6,423

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 14—Composition of Sophomore Student Aid Packages and Average Student Expense Budgets, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

	Percentage of Typical Student Aid Package from:					
Control and Type of Institution	Grants and Scholarships	Student Employment	Loans[1]	Other Sources[2]	Total	Average Expense Budget (In dollars)
All institutions	36.1	13.4	21.8	28.7	100.0	5,693
Public institutions	38.0	18.7	19.4	23.9	100.0	3,923
Universities	31.1	17.7	24.4	26.9	100.0	4,818
Four-year colleges	36.3	17.5	21.0	25.1	100.0	4,164
Two-year colleges	39.9	19.4	17.9	22.8	100.0	3,713
Private institutions	35.2	10.7	23.0	31.1	100.0	7,420
Universities	35.0	10.4	20.2	34.4	100.0	10,164
Four-year colleges	35.1	11.1	22.5	31.3	100.0	7,465
Two-year colleges	35.3	8.5	27.3	28.9	100.0	6,416

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 15—Composition of Upper Division Student Aid Packages and Average Student Expense Budgets, by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

	Percentage of Typical Student Aid Package from:					
Control and Type of Institution	Grants and Scholarships	Student Employment	Loans[1]	Other Sources[2]	Total	Average Expense Budget (In dollars)
All institutions	34.5	12.3	23.0	30.2	100.0	6,726
Public institutions	33.8	17.8	23.3	25.1	100.0	4,403
Universities	29.9	18.0	26.4	25.7	100.0	4,902
Four-year colleges	35.2	17.7	22.3	24.8	100.0	4,255
Private institutions	34.6	11.1	23.0	31.4	100.0	7,683
Universities	34.7	10.6	20.4	34.3	100.0	10,174
Four-year colleges	34.6	11.1	23.2	31.1	100.0	7,523

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

[1] Includes Guaranteed Student Loans and National Direct Student Loans.

[2] Includes student and family contribution.

TABLE 16—Average Expense Budget and Percentage Distribution of Student Aid Packages for Freshmen, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

		Budget Ranges				
Source of Support	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Average expense budget ($)	(5,654)	(2,619)	(3,709)	(5,221)	(6,747)	(9,156)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Grants and scholarships	36.6	51.0	38.3	35.0	34.0	36.9
Student employment	12.8	21.0	17.7	13.6	11.0	9.5
Loans[1]	21.7	7.0	19.9	22.6	25.4	21.3
Other sources[2]	28.9	21.0	24.2	28.7	29.6	32.2

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 17—Average Expense Budget and Percentage Distribution of Student Aid Packages for Sophomores, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

		Budget Ranges				
Source of Support	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Average expense budget ($)	(5,693)	(2,739)	(3,781)	(5,209)	(6,805)	(9,153)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Grants and scholarships	36.1	49.6	37.6	35.5	33.6	35.8
Student employment	13.4	22.1	17.8	14.2	11.5	10.6
Loans[1]	21.8	8.2	20.6	22.6	24.6	21.6
Other sources[2]	28.7	20.1	24.1	27.6	30.3	32.0

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 18—Average Expense Budget and Percentage Distribution of Student Aid Packages for Upper Classmen, by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

		Budget Ranges				
Source of Support	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Average expense budget ($)	(6,726)	(4,075)	(4,023)	(5,365)	(6,937)	(9,217)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Grants and scholarships	34.5	51.4	34.0	35.1	30.9	36.1
Student employment	12.3	19.9	17.6	12.8	12.5	10.6
Loans[1]	23.0	19.3	23.8	23.6	26.2	20.9
Other sources[2]	30.2	9.4	24.6	28.5	30.4	32.4

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

[1] Includes Guaranteed Student Loans and National Direct Student Loans.

[2] Includes student and family contribution.

TABLE 19—Estimated Average Full-time Freshman Expense Budget, by Source of Funds and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

(In dollars)

Control and Type of Institution	Average Expense Budget	Amount from: Grants and Scholarships	Amount from: Student Employment	Amount from: Loans[1]	Amount from: Other Sources[2]
All institutions	$ 5,654	$2,071	$721	$1,229	$1,632
Public institutions	3,868	1,463	720	742	943
Universities	4,804	1,573	811	1,121	1,298
Four-year colleges	4,141	1,536	717	859	1,029
Two-year colleges	3,639	1,419	709	646	864
Private institutions	7,395	2,664	722	1,705	2,304
Universities	10,204	3,784	911	2,009	3,500
Four-year colleges	7,428	2,667	755	1,685	2,320
Two-year colleges	6,423	2,321	517	1,706	1,880

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 20—Estimated Average Full-time Sophomore Expense Budget, by Source of Funds and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

(In dollars)

Control and Type of Institution	Average Expense Budget	Amount from: Grants and Scholarships	Amount from: Student Employment	Amount from: Loans[1]	Amount from: Other Sources[2]
All institutions	$ 5,693	$2,056	$ 765	$1,241	$1,631
Public institutions	3,923	1,490	735	762	937
Universities	4,818	1,497	852	1,175	1,294
Four-year colleges	4,164	1,512	730	876	1,046
Two-year colleges	3,713	1,480	722	663	848
Private institutions	7,420	2,609	794	1,708	2,309
Universities	10,164	3,559	1,055	2,057	3,493
Four-year colleges	7,465	2,623	832	1,677	2,333
Two-year colleges	6,416	2,267	546	1,752	1,852

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 21—Estimated Average Full-time Upper Division Expense Budget, by Source of Funds and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

(In dollars)

Control and Type of Institution	Average Expense Budget	Amount from: Grants and Scholarships	Amount from: Student Employment	Amount from: Loans[1]	Amount from: Other Sources[2]
All institutions	$ 6,726	$2,319	$ 830	$1,549	$2,028
Public institutions	4,403	1,490	783	1,027	1,103
Universities	4,902	1,464	884	1,295	1,260
Four-year colleges	4,255	1,498	753	948	1,057
Private institutions	7,683	2,660	849	1,764	2,409
Universities	10,174	3,529	1,080	2,078	3,487
Four-year colleges	7,523	2,605	835	1,744	2,340

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

[1] Includes Guaranteed Student Loans and National Direct Student Loans.

[2] Includes student and family contribution.

TABLE 22—Estimated Average Freshman Expense Budget, by Source of Support and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

		Budget Ranges				
Source of Support	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Total	$5,654	$2,619	$3,709	$5,221	$6,747	$9,156
Grants and scholarships	2,071	1,335	1,420	1,826	2,294	3,381
Student employment	721	551	656	713	744	869
Loans[1]	1,229	184	737	1,182	1,715	1,955
Other sources[2]	1,632	549	896	1,501	1,994	2,951

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 23—Estimated Average Sophomore Expense Budget, by Source of Support and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

		Budget Ranges				
Source of Support	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Total	$5,693	$2,739	$3,781	$5,209	$6,805	$9,153
Grants and scholarships	2,056	1,358	1,422	1,852	2,286	3,281
Student employment	765	606	671	741	785	970
Loans[1]	1,241	224	778	1,179	1,672	1,978
Other sources[2]	1,631	552	910	1,438	2,062	2,925

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

TABLE 24—Estimated Average Upper Division Expense Budget, by Source of Support and by Freshman Expense Budget Ranges, Fall 1982

		Budget Ranges				
Source of Support	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Total	$6,726	$4,075	$4,023	$5,365	$6,937	$9,217
Grants and scholarships	2,319	2,093	1,369	1,881	2,146	3,325
Student employment	830	812	708	686	867	977
Loans[1]	1,549	785	956	1,266	1,816	1,929
Other sources[2]	2,028	385	990	1,532	2,108	2,986

Note: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The figures in this table are institutionally weighted estimates.

[1] Includes Guaranteed Student Loans and National Direct Student Loans.

[2] Includes student and family contribution.

TABLE 25—Differences in the Composition of Freshman Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution

Control and Type of Institution	Percentage of Institutions That Reported: No Change	More Work/ Loans in 1982-83	More Grants/ Scholarships in 1982-83	More from Other Sources in 1982-83	Other Changes
All institutions	59.4	30.0	10.5	7.6	8.1
Public institutions	67.3	19.1	9.0	8.8	7.7
Universities	55.2	29.2	5.2	10.4	10.4
Four-year colleges	57.9	24.8	7.5	9.2	10.8
Two-year colleges	72.7	15.5	10.2	8.4	6.2
Private institutions	51.8	40.6	11.9	6.5	8.6
Universities	30.0	43.3	35.0	10.0	5.0
Four-year colleges	45.7	47.8	13.0	6.2	10.7
Two-year colleges	85.7	7.1	0.0	7.1	0.0

Note: Percentages may add across to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

TABLE 26—Differences in the Composition of Upper Division Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Control and Type of Institution

Control and Type of Institution	Percentage of Institutions That Reported: No Change	More Work/ Loans in 1982-83	More Grants/ Scholarships in 1982-83	More from Other Sources in 1982-83	Other Changes
All institutions	51.0	42.8	8.2	6.7	8.1
Public institutions	55.8	29.0	5.0	9.2	10.6
Universities	51.0	34.4	4.2	9.4	10.4
Four-year colleges	57.2	27.4	5.3	9.2	10.8
Private institutions	49.1	48.5	9.6	5.6	7.1
Universities	41.7	45.0	26.7	8.3	3.3
Four-year colleges	49.6	48.7	8.5	5.5	7.4

Note: Percentages may add across to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

TABLE 27—Differences in the Composition of Freshman Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Freshman Expense

		Budget Ranges				
Type of Change	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Percentage of institutions that reported:						
No change	59.4	92.8	68.4	56.3	57.6	38.8
More work/loans in 1982-83	30.0	3.6	21.2	26.9	32.1	54.2
More grants/scholarships in 1982-83	10.5	2.5	9.1	7.6	10.8	18.1
More from other sources in 1982-83	7.6	1.7	6.5	12.2	3.4	10.8
Other changes	8.1	2.5	8.4	9.5	12.7	4.1

Note: Percentages may add to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

TABLE 28—Differences in the Composition of Upper Division Student Aid Packages Between 1981-82 and 1982-83, by Freshman Expense

		Budget Ranges				
Type of Change	All Institutions	Less than $3,000	$3,000-$4,499	$4,500-$5,999	$6,000-$7,499	$7,500 or more
Percentage of institutions that reported:						
No change	51.0	70.0	57.7	53.4	50.3	45.4
More work/loans in 1982-83	42.8	15.4	31.6	34.2	48.8	51.9
More grants/ scholarships in 1982-83	8.2	--	3.9	4.6	12.3	10.6
More from other sources in 1982-83	6.7	--	8.3	7.7	0.3	9.8
Other changes	8.1	14.6	9.0	13.0	9.1	3.4

Note: Percentages may add to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

TABLE 29—Percentage of Institutions That Use Computers for Student Aid Administration, by Function and by Control and Type of Institution, Fall 1982

(In percentages)

Function for which Computers Are Used	All Institutions	Public				Private			
		Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges	Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges
Student billing	54.6	52.8	85.4	73.3	41.6	56.4	88.3	61.0	28.6
Recording academic progress	52.9	59.3	74.0	64.3	55.8	46.8	60.0	50.2	28.6
Disbursing grants	34.2	42.6	84.4	52.4	34.4	26.1	83.3	25.5	14.3
Loan collection	34.2	31.3	76.0	52.1	18.7	37.0	71.7	40.2	14.3
Processing aid applications	27.9	31.3	79.2	58.8	15.9	24.6	63.3	21.4	28.6
Reporting to funders	26.4	31.9	68.8	51.1	20.7	21.3	53.3	24.3	0.0
Disbursing loans	25.6	30.6	78.1	49.8	18.2	20.9	71.7	19.4	14.3
Determining awards	14.3	16.1	53.1	23.2	9.4	12.6	31.7	11.1	14.3
Other	11.0	10.8	16.8	11.9	9.8	11.1	16.7	10.0	14.2
Do not use computers	23.7	20.4	1.0	8.4	27.0	26.7	1.7	27.8	28.6

Note: Percentages will add to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

TABLE 30—Bases for Satisfactory Progress Standards for Federal Student Aid Eligibility

(In percentages)

Bases for Standards	All Institutions	Public				Private			
		Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges	Total	Universities	4-year Colleges	2-year Colleges
Recommendations of institutional committee	74.8	74.0	69.8	69.9	76.3	75.6	68.3	75.4	78.6
Self-regulation guidelines	62.3	64.0	57.3	66.8	63.6	60.7	76.7	58.9	64.3
State requirements	25.9	23.9	21.9	25.7	23.4	27.9	21.7	26.6	35.7
Accrediting agency recommendations	18.2	13.4	17.7	13.0	13.1	22.9	15.0	22.2	28.6
Other	4.1	6.6	12.5	7.8	5.4	1.6	6.7	1.6	0.0

Note: Percentages will add to more than 100 percent because multiple responses were permitted.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
(202) 833-4757

January 21, 1983

Dear Higher Education Panel Representative:

Attached is Higher Education Panel Survey No. 60, "Student Financial Aid for Full-time Undergraduates, Fall 1982," which is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. It seeks to determine the proportion of the undergraduate student body that receives financial aid, the amount received, data on the "packaging" of the aid, and information on certain institutional procedures and policies related to its distribution. These data are needed by the Department to plan and evaluate major student aid programs more effectively.

We assume that the director of student financial assistance or an official in the student aid office would be the appropriate person to complete the questionnaire, and we have enclosed a letter explaining the survey's purpose to that individual. As usual, however, we rely on your selection of the most appropriate respondent.

Please understand that your institution's response will be protected to the maximum extent permissible by law. As with all our surveys, the data you provide will be reported in summary fashion only and will not be identifiable with your institution. This survey is authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

Please ask the person completing the questionnaire to return it to us by February 25, 1983, enclosed in the postpaid preaddressed envelope.

If you have any problems or questions, please do not hesitate to telephone us collect at (202) 833-4757. Thank you, once again, for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Atelsek

Frank J. Atelsek
Panel Director

Enclosure

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
(202) 833-4757

January 21, 1983

Dear Student Financial Aid Officer:

The Department of Education has asked the American Council on Education's Higher Education Panel (HEP) to conduct a survey of student financial aid with special attention directed to its funding, the composition of "typical" student aid packages, and selected procedures and policies. The attached HEP Survey Number 60, "Student Financial Aid for Full-time Undergraduates, Fall 1982" has been designed to do this. We are asking you to assist us by completing the attached questionnaire.

As you know, major changes have taken place in the federal student aid programs this year, and additional revisions are being proposed for 1983-84. Current data are needed now to help us understand how the new arrangements are affecting the distribution of aid and to evaluate some of the changes.

We realize that this is a very busy time for you, but we hope you can find the time to help us in this important survey. We also realize that precise data for several of the questions are not yet available for this year. We ask, therefore, that you provide your best estimates in those instances where exact figures are not at hand.

Please understand that your institution's response will be protected to the maximum extent permissible by law. As with all our surveys, the data you provide will be reported in summary fashion only and will not be identifiable with your institution. This survey is authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it to us by February 25, 1983 in the enclosed postage paid preaddressed envelope. If you have any problems or questions concerning the survey, please do not hesitate to telephone us collect at (202) 833-4757.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Atelsek

Frank J. Atelsek
Panel Director

Attachment

OMB No. 3145-0009
Exp. 6/30/84

AMERICAN
COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION

Higher Education Panel Survey No. 60
STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
for
FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATES
FALL 1982

DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Questions 1–3. **Student aid is meant to include all forms of student financial assistance except social security benefits, veterans benefits, and Guaranteed Student Loans (GSLs). Be sure to include all scholarships and grants (including remission of tuition and fees), institutionally arranged student employment (including college work-study programs) and loans, with the exception of the GSLs as noted above.**

Questions 4, 5. **Dependent/independent status. A student's status regarding dependency on parents for financial support, according to the definition your institution uses for federal student aid purposes.**

Question 7. On line 7a, **show the percentage of the typical student aid package accounted for by all scholarships and grants, including Pell grants, SEOG's, institutional scholarships and grants (including remission of tuition and fees), etc. Exclude social security benefits and veterans benefits.**

On line 7c, **include loans from institutional, public, and/or private student loan programs. Be sure to include National Direct Student Loans (NDSLs) and Guaranteed Student Loans (GSLs). Note that in this question, unlike questions 1–3, we are asking that your estimates *include* GSLs insofar as you are aware of their contribution to the typical student aid package.**

On line 7d, **show the percentage of the typical student aid package accounted for by sources other than the types listed on the previous lines. This will usually represent the contribution of the student and his/her family and, when added to the figures on lines 7a, 7b, and 7c should total 100 percent.**

---

1. Please estimate the proportion of your *full-time undergraduate* student body that, in the fall term 1982, received some form of student financial aid from programs that *use your institution as the delivery agent.* ——————▷ ________ %

2. Please indicate or estimate the total amount of all types of financial aid provided to *full-time undergraduate* students at your institution through programs that *use your institution as the delivery agent.*

   1981–82 $ ________

   1982–83 $ ________

3. Of the amounts shown in question 2, what percentage was funded by *federal* student aid programs?

   1981–82 ________ %

   1982–83 ________ %

4. Please characterize your institution's fall 1982 full-time undergraduate student aid recipients by their family income level.

Total Family Income	Percentage of Full-time *Dependent* Undergraduates	Percentage of Full-time *Independent* Undergraduates
a. $0–$7,499	________ %	________ %
b. $7,500–$14,999	________ %	________ %
c. $15,000–$29,999	________ %	________ %
d. $30,000 or more	________ %	________ %
Total	100 %	100 %

5. What percentage of your undergraduate students who receive *federal* student aid are classified as "independent" students? ——▷ _____ %

6. Is the fall 1982 enrollment of full-time undergraduates at your institution below your planned enrollment level for this year?

a. _____ No. If no, go directly to question 7.

b. _____ Yes. If yes, to what do you attribute the enrollment shortfall?

____

____

7. Student Aid Packages. To the extent that there is a "typical student aid package" at your institution for each type of student shown below, indicate the proportion of that "package" that comes from each of the sources shown on lines 7a through 7d. Make sure that the percentages total to 100 percent.

On line 7f, please indicate the average annual student expense budgets at your institution. For public institutions, show only the expense budgets for *in-state* students.

	Percent of Typical Aid Package for-		
Source	Freshmen	Sophomores	Upper Division Students (Juniors & Seniors)
a. Grants and scholarships	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
b. Institutionally arranged student employment	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
c. Loans (including NDSLs and GSLs)	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
d. Other sources (student's savings, summer earnings, etc.; student's family's contributions, etc.)	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %
f. Average student expense budget (include tuition & fees, room & board, transportation, books & supplies, and other expenses)	$ _____	$ _____	$ _____

8. Did the typical aid package for *freshmen* in 1982–83 differ from that used in 1981–82? Check all that apply.

a. _____ No, about the same as 1981–82

b. _____ Yes, more work and/or loans

c. _____ Yes, more grants and scholarships

d. _____ Yes, more from "other sources"

e. _____ Other: specify. _______________

____

____

9. Did the typical aid package for *upper division* students in 1982–83 differ from that used in 1981–82? Check all that apply.

a. _____ No, about the same as 1981–82

b. _____ Yes, more work and/or loans

c. _____ Yes, more grants and scholarships

d. _____ Yes, more from "other sources"

e. _____ Other: specify. _______________

____

____

10. Please indicate if your institution uses a computer for the student aid activities listed below. Check all that apply.

a. _____ Processing student aid applications
b. _____ Determining the amount of the student aid awards
c. _____ Loan disbursement
d. _____ Grant disbursement
e. _____ Student billing (tuition, fees, etc.)
f. _____ Loan collection
g. _____ Academic progress, graduation
h. _____ Student aid reports to funding agencies
i. _____ Other: specify. ____________________

11. Are your institution's standards for satisfactory progress for maintaining students' eligibility for federal student aid programs based on the following? Check all that apply.

a. _____ Accrediting agency recommendations
b. _____ State requirements
c. _____ Self-regulation guidelines set forth in the joint statement from the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO), and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA)
d. _____ Recommendations of an institutional committee
e. _____ Other: specify source. ____________________

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this form by February 25, 1983

to: Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 829
Washington, DC 20036

Please keep a copy of this survey for your records.

Person completing the form:

Name ____________________
Title ____________________
Telephone (___) ____________________

If you have any questions or problems concerning this survey, please call HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757.

Appendix B: Technical Notes

The survey instrument was sent to all 698 Panel colleges and universities that were deemed to have undergraduate programs. Excluded were independent schools of medicine, health sciences, theology, business, law, education, and other institutions that offered only postbaccalaureate study. Responses were received from 557 institutions, for an overall response rate of 80 percent. Table B-1 shows the population and responses by stratum.

TABLE B-1—Stratification Design

Cell	Type of Institution	Population	Respondents
	Total	2,801	557
01	Public universities	111	96
02	Private universities	71	60
04	Public black four-year colleges FTE 3,000+	13	9
05	Public nonblack four-year colleges FTE 8,750+	103	78
07	Private nonblack four-year colleges FTE 8,750+	12	8
08	Public two-year colleges FTE 8,750+	36	25
09	Public four-year colleges FTE 3,700-8,750	76	31
10	Public four-year colleges FTE<3,700	181	27
11	Private four-year colleges FTE 2,000-8,750	131	33
12	Private four-year colleges FTE 1,000-1,999	276	40
13	Private four-year colleges FTE<1,000	685	21
14	Public two-year colleges FTE 5,100-8,750	62	25
15	Public two-year colleges FTE 3,260-5,100	104	30
16	Public two-year colleges FTE 1,600-3,260	177	34
17	Public two-year colleges FTE<1,600	520	26
18	Private two-year colleges	243	14

Weighting

Data from the 557 responding institutions were statistically adjusted to represent the population of institutions with undergraduate programs. The weighting technique used was the standard one employed for Panel surveys. Data received from Panel members were adjusted for item and institutional nonresponse within each cell. Then institutional weights were applied to bring Panel data up to estimates representative of the national population.

However, for a number of questions that requested percentages rather than actual counts, prior to the assignment of institutional weights, it was necessary to convert them into counts—either of dollars or of students—before they could be weighted and aggregated for national and sectoral totals.

For question 1 (percentage of students receiving aid), the percentage provided by the institution was multiplied by its full-time undergraduate enrollment contained in the Higher Education General Information System (HEGIS) tape.

For question 4 (distribution of families by income level), the percentage provided by the institution was converted into a student count by using data from the HEGIS tape and the dependent/independent proportion from the survey's question 5 (percentage of federally assisted students deemed independent). In both of these instances, after these student counts were estimated and aggregated by institutional sector, they were converted back into the percentages shown in the report.

For question 7 (composition of student aid packages), the percentages reported by the institutions were multiplied by the institution's average student expense budget to get dollar figures that could then be aggregated by institutional type and control and subsequently converted back into percentage distributions. For this question the procedure did *not* include any provision for enrollments other than those included in the HEP stratification system. In essence, the data show "typical undergraduate student aid packages" for the nation's 2,800 institutions with undergraduate programs.

At the request of the sponsor, the aid package data were recalculated with a step added to weight the results by enrollment. These results, when converted back into percentages, did not vary widely from the national and sectoral estimates reported here. Copies of these additional tables may be obtained by contacting HEP offices.

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Table B-2 compares survey respondents and nonrespondents against several variables. Higher-than-average response rates were recorded for universities, and for other large institutions. Two-year colleges and institutions with FTE enrollments of less than 1,000 had lower-than-average response rates.

Reliability of Survey Estimates

Because the statistics presented in this report are based on a sample, they will differ somewhat from the figures which would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same survey instrument, instructions, and procedures. As in any survey, the results are also subject to reporting and processing errors and errors due to nonresponse. To the extent possible, these types of errors were kept to a minimum by methods built into the survey procedures.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability—that is, the variations that might occur by chance because only a sample of the institutions is surveyed. The chances are about 90 out of 100 that it would be less than 1.65 times the standard error; about 95 out of 100 that it would be less than 1.96 times the

TABLE B-2—Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

(In percentages)

Institutional Characteristics	Respondents (N=557)	Nonrespondents (N=141)	Response Rate
Total	100.0	100.0	79.8
Control			
Public	68.4	71.6	79.0
Private	31.6	28.4	81.5
Type			
Universities	28.0	15.6	87.6
Four-year colleges	44.3	41.1	81.0
Two-year colleges	27.6	43.3	71.6
Region			
East	23.5	30.4	75.3
Midwest	29.5	28.4	80.4
South	26.0	20.6	83.3
West	21.0	20.6	80.1
Total undergraduate full-time equivalent enrollment (1976)			
Less than 1,000	13.5	29.8	64.1
1,000-4,999	46.5	44.7	80.4
5,000-9,999	25.1	14.2	87.5
10,000 and above	14.9	11.3	83.8

standard error; and about 99 out of 100 that it would be less than 2.5 times as large. Thus, knowing the standard error permits us to specify a range within which we can have a stated confidence that a given estimate would lie if a complete census, rather than a sample survey, had been conducted.

In this survey, the question that lends itself most appropriately to this type of analysis is question 2, the amount of financial aid provided in fiscal years 1982 and 1983. As Table B-3 shows, the 90 percent confidence interval for 1981-82 is plus or minus $283.8 million. Thus, chances are about 90 out of 100 that a complete census would show the amount of aid provided in 1981-82 would be more than $7,308,900,000 and less than $7,876,500,000.

Table B-3 shows 90 percent confidence intervals for the amount of aid provided in 1981-82 and 1982-83 for all institutions and for public and private institutions separately.

TABLE B-3—Ninety Percent Confidence Intervals for Selected Survey Estimates by Control of Institution

(In millions of dollars)

	All Institutions		Public Institutions		Private Institutions	
Items	Estimate	Confidence Intervals (+ or −)	Estimate	Confidence Intervals (+ or −)	Estimate	Confidence Intervals (+ or −)
Amount of financial aid to full-time undergraduates in:						
Fiscal year 1981-82	$7,592.7	$283.8	$4,176.9	$160.5	$3,415.8	$235.3
Fiscal year 1982-83	$7,669.6	$287.6	$4,156.3	$164.7	$3,513.3	$237.3

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Health Research Facilities: A Survey of Doctorate-Granting Institution.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 28, February, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Faculty Research: Level of Activity and Choice of Area.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 29, January, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctorate Faculty in Selected Science and Engineering Departments, 1975 to 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 30, August, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Energy Costs and Energy Conservation Programs in Colleges and Universities: 1972-73 and 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 31, April, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Foreign Area Research Support Within Organized Research Centers at Selected Universities, FY 1972 and 1976.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 32, December, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **College and University Services for Older Adults.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 33, February, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Production of Doctorates in the Biosciences, 1975-1980: An Experimental Forecast.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 34, November, 1977.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Composition of College and University Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 35, August, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 36, September, 1977.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **International Scientific Activities at Selected Institutions, 1975-76 and 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 37, January, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **New Full-Time Faculty 1976-77: Hiring Patterns by Field and Educational Attainment.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 38, March, 1978.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Nontenure-Track Science Personnel: Opportunities for Independent Research.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 39, September, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Scientific and Technical Cooperation with Developing Countries, 1977-78.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 40, August, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Special Programs for Female and Minority Graduate Students.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 41, November, 1978.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **The Institutional Share of Undergraduate Financial Assistance, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 42, May, 1979.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctoral Faculty in Science and Engineering: Trends in Composition and Research Activity.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 43, February, 1979.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Shared Use of Scientific Equipment at Colleges and Universities, Fall 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 44, November, 1979.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Newly Qualified Elementary and Secondary School Teachers, 1977-78 and 1978-79.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 45, February, 1980.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Refund Policies and Practices of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 46, February, 1980.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Expenditures for Scientific Research Equipment at Ph.D.-Granting Institutions, FY 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 47, March, 1980.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Tenure Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 48, July, 1980.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Trends in Financial Indicators of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 49, April, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **An Analysis of Travel by Academic Scientists and Engineers to International Scientific Meetings in 1979-80.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 50, February, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 51, August, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Recruitment and Retention of Full-Time Engineering Faculty, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 52, October, 1981.

Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Sabbatical and Research Leaves in Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 53, February, 1982.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Andersen, Charles J. **Undergraduate Student Credit Hours in Science, Engineering, and the Humanities, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 54, June, 1982.

Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **An Assessment of College Student Housing and Physical Plant.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 55, October, 1982.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Financial Support for the Humanities: A Special Methodological Report.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 56, January, 1983.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Neuroscience Personnel and Training.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 57, June, 1983.

Atelsek, Frank J. **Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 58, February, 1984.

Andersen, Charles J. **Student Quality in the Humanities: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 59, February, 1984.

- A 1410-1.17 A 9/84 -

FULL-TIME HUMANITIES FACULTY FALL 1982

Irene L. Gomberg
Frank J. Atelsek



HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL REPORT NUMBER 61
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

AUGUST
1984

A Survey Funded by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education,
and the National Endowment for the Humanities

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

J. W. Peltason, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, The National Endowment for the Humanities, and the U.S. Department of Education (NSF Contract SRS-8117037).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank J. Atelsek, *Panel Director*
Irene L. Gomberg, *Assistant Director*
Charles J. Andersen, *Senior Staff Associate*
Clare McManus, *Research Assistant*
Bernard R. Greene, *Research Analyst/Programmer*
Shirley B. Kahan, *Staff Assistant*

HEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Elaine El-Khawas, *Vice President* for Policy Analysis and Research, ACE, *Chair*
Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., *President,* Council of Graduate Schools in the United States
Robert M. Rosenzweig, *President,* Association of American Universities
D. F. Finn, *Executive Vice President,* National Association of College and University Business Officers
Connie Sutton, *Vice President* for Professional Services, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*
Armen Tashdinian, National Endowment for the Humanities
Salvatore Corrallo, U.S. Department of Education
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, National Center for Education Statistics, *Chairman*
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation
Jeffrey Thomas, National Endowment for the Humanities

Additional copies of this report are available from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

Full-time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1982

Irene L. Gomberg
Frank J. Atelsek

Higher Education Panel Reports
Number 61 August 1984

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C. 20036

This material is based upon research supported jointly by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Endowment for the Humanities under NSF contract #SRS-8117037. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring agencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments iv
List of Figures v
List of Detailed Tables vi
Highlights viii
Background 1
Methods Summary 1
Findings 2
  Institutional Characteristics of Faculty 2
  Personal Characteristics of Faculty 3
  Professional and Educational Attainment 3
  New Appointments 9
  Discipline Highlights 9
Summary 13
Detailed Statistical Tables 14
Appendix A: Survey Instrument 46
Appendix B: Technical Notes 52

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, which also sponsored a similar study of 1979 faculty. The idea for the survey originated with Arnita Jones and Stanley F. Turesky, both of the Endowment's Office of Program and Policy Studies.

Data processing was performed by Group Operations, Inc., and editorial services were provided by Nancy Suniewick. ACE's Advisory Committee and the Federal Advisory Board and its Technical Advisory Committee offered their usual high level of expertise and direction.

Again, our continued appreciation and gratitude go to the campus representatives and department heads who responded to the survey.

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. Estimates of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Institutional Setting, Fall 1982 2

Figure 2. Gender and Minority Status of Humanities Faculty, by Institutional Setting, Fall 1982 4

Figure 3. Institutional Setting of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982 4

Figure 4. Field Distribution of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982 5

Figure 5A. Tenure Status of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982 6

Figure 5B. Tenure Status of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and by Minority Status, Fall 1982 6

Figure 6A. Tenured Humanities Faculty Who Are Full Professors, by Gender and Minority Status 7

Figure 6B. Tenured Humanities Faculty Who Are Full Professors, by Gender and by Minority Status 8

Figure 7. Percentage of Humanities Faculty with a Humanities Doctorate, by Gender and Minority Status 8

Figure 8. Number of New Humanities Faculty Appointments, by Tenure Status 10

Figure 9. Institutional Setting of Humanities Faculty, by Discipline, Fall 1982 10

Figure 10. Gender and Minority Status of Humanities Faculty, by Discipline, Fall 1982 11

Figure 11. Percentage of Humanities Faculty Who Are Tenured, by Discipline 11

Figure 12. Percentage of Humanities Faculty with a Humanities Doctorate, by Discipline 12

Figure 13. Percentage of Tenured Humanities Faculty Who Are Full Professors, by Discipline 12

LIST OF DETAILED TABLES

Page

Table 1. College and University Survey Population, Fall 1982 14

Table 2. Estimated Full-time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1982 15

Tables 3–15. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982 15-21

- 3. Total Institutions 15
- 4. Public Institutions 16
  - 5. Universities 16
  - 6. Four-year Colleges 17
  - 7. Two-year Colleges 17
- 8. Private Institutions 18
  - 9. Universities 18
  - 10. Four-year Colleges 19
  - 11. Two-year Colleges 19
- 12. English 20
- 13. History 20
- 14. Modern Languages 21
- 15. Philosophy 21

Tables 16–24. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982 22-30

- 16. Total Institutions 22
- 17. Public Institutions 23
  - 18. Universities 24
  - 19. Four-year Colleges 25
  - 20. Two-year Colleges 26
- 21. Private Institutions 27
  - 22. Universities 28
  - 23. Four-year Colleges 29
  - 24. Two-year Colleges 30

Tables 25–33. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982 31-39

- 25. Total Institutions 31
- 26. Public Institutions 32
  - 27. Universities 33
  - 28. Four-year Colleges 34
  - 29. Two-year Colleges 35
- 30. Private Institutions 36
  - 31. Universities 37
  - 32. Four-year Colleges 38
  - 33. Two-year Colleges 39

Page

Table 34. Percentage Distribution of Full-time Humanities Faculty Hired for AY 1983–83 and Expected to be Hired for AY 1983–84, by Tenure Status and by Type and Control of Institution 40

Table 35. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Discipline and by Type of Institution 41

Table 36. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and by Type and Control of Institution 42

Table 37. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status and by Type and Control of Institution 42

Table 38. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and by Tenure Status and Rank 43

Table 39. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status and by Tenure Status and Rank 43

Tables 40–41. Comparison Between AY 1979–80 and AY 1982–83 in the Number of New Full-time Humanities Faculty Appointments 44

- 40. By Type and Control of Institution 44
- 41. By Discipline 44

Table 42. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Highest Degree Held in the Humanities and by Discipline 45

HIGHLIGHTS

- In the fall of 1982, 58,700 full-time faculty were teaching in the core humanities disciplines of English, history, modern languages, and philosophy. Five of every 10 were teaching at four-year colleges, 3 of every 10 at universities, and 2 of every 10 at two-year colleges. Since fall 1979, the number of faculty increased at universities and decreased at two-year colleges.

- Full-time faculty teach English at nearly all the institutions in the survey population. In contrast, full-time faculty teach philosophy at only two-thirds of the institutions. The distribution of faculty varies further by institutional setting. For example, full-time instruction in all four humanities disciplines is offered at nearly all the universities, but full-time instruction in philosophy is offered at fewer than two-fifths of the two-year colleges.

- Sixty-four percent—more than 6 of every 10—of the full-time humanities faculty are nonminority men. Only 3 of every 10 full-time humanities faculty are women. One of every 10 is a minority group member; fewer than 5 percent are minority men and fewer than 4 percent are minority women. Since 1979, the number of nonminority women has grown by 5 percent and the number of minority men has fallen by 3 percent.

  Women and minorities have greater relative representation on humanities faculties at two-year colleges than at universities.

- Seventy-three percent of the full-time humanities faculty are tenured. Fourteen percent are untenured but are in the tenure track, and the remaining 13 percent are outside the tenure track. These proportions have remained steady since 1979, but the number untenured in the tenure track fell by 11 percent while the number in positions outside the tenure track grew by 10 percent.

- The humanities faculty tenure rate is highest at four-year colleges (76 percent). The next highest is at universities (73 percent), and the lowest is at two-year colleges (67 percent).

- Two-thirds of the full-time humanities faculty have a doctorate degree in a humanities discipline. At universities the proportion is 88 percent; at four-year colleges, 75 percent; and at two-year colleges, 20 percent.

- Approximately 3,400, or 6 percent of the core humanities faculty teaching in 1982–83, were newly appointed that year. This represents a 7 percent decline from the number of new appointments made in 1979–80.

BACKGROUND

In 1980, the National Endowment for the Humanities sponsored a survey that, for the first time, developed a body of information about a significant segment of the humanities labor force—higher education faculty.[1] Data were obtained about those who were teaching full time in fall 1979 in English, history, modern languages, and philosophy. The data included information on gender, ethnic/racial background, academic rank and tenure status, and level of educational attainment.

One of the Endowment's primary functions is to monitor the distribution of human resources within and across humanities disciplines. To aid the Endowment in this effort, a second survey was recently conducted, identical to the first but seeking information about faculty in fall 1982. Using these survey results, the Endowment not only can enumerate and describe the humanities faculty in four major disciplines, but also can acquire a better understanding of faculty career patterns and short-term faculty demand. Further, since these findings are directly comparable with those of the earlier survey, the Endowment will be able to evaluate changes that have occurred over the three-year period.

---

[1] See HEP report No. 51, *Selected Characteristics of Full-time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979* (Washington: American Council on Education), August 1981.

METHODS SUMMARY

The Higher Education Panel forms the basis of an ongoing survey research program created in 1971 by the American Council on Education. Its purpose is to conduct specialized surveys on topics of current policy interest to the higher education community and to government agencies.

The Panel is a disproportionate stratified sample of 760 colleges and universities drawn from the 3,000 higher education institutions listed in the National Center for Education Statistics' *Education Directory*. All institutions in the population are grouped according to the Panel's stratification design, which is based primarily upon institution type (university, four-year college, two-year college), control (public, private), and size (full-time-equivalent enrollment). For any given survey, either the entire Panel or an appropriate subgroup is used.

The survey operation is dependent upon a network of campus representatives at the Panel institutions who, through their presidents, have agreed to participate. The representatives receive the Panel questionnaires and direct them to the most appropriate campus officials for response.

This study was divided into two parts. The first sought an institutionwide count of all full-time humanities faculty during the last three years. These data will be reported separately at a later date. The second part requested data about specific faculty characteristics as of fall 1982 in each of four departments: English, history, modern languages, and philosophy.

The questionnaires (see Appendix A) were mailed on April 20, 1983, to the same Panel colleges and universities surveyed in the earlier study.[2] After several mail and telephone follow-ups during June and July, the field phase of the survey was closed on August 1, 1983. Departmental data had been received from 75 percent of the 673 survey institutions.

Data from responding institutions were statistically adjusted (weighted) to represent the national population of colleges and universities with full-time humanities faculty. Data from the responding Panel institutions were first adjusted for *departmental* nonresponse by imputing the mean values reported for each stratum of the Panel. Weights were then applied to adjust for *institutional* nonresponse so that the data from Panel respondents fully represented the national population. (Institutional weights are based upon the ratio of the number of respondents to the number of institutions in the population, separately for each stratum.)

The technical notes (Appendix B) contain the stratification design, a comparison of respondents and nonrespondents, and a discussion of the reliability of the survey estimates.

---

[2] Several types of institutions were not included in this study, nor in the 1979 study. These were independent medical schools, religious or bible colleges, and certain other specialized institutions, such as engineering and health professional colleges.

FINDINGS

This report describes 58,700 full-time faculty who, in fall 1982, were teaching the four core[3] humanities disciplines—English, history, modern languages, and philosophy—at 2,400 colleges and universities. The report describes where and what they were teaching, their personal characteristics, and the level of their educational and professional attainment. There is also a brief section highlighting each of the disciplines.

Between fall 1979 and fall 1982, there has been virtually no change in the number of full-time faculty in the disciplines studied. A total of 58,600 were reported in 1979, and 58,700 were reported in 1982. Although the totals did not change, the faculty mix was altered slightly by institutional setting, by discipline, by gender, and by minority status. For the most part, however, shifts tended to be no greater than 3 percent in any direction. For a better understanding of such small changes, readers should refer to the confidence intervals for the sampling errors in Appendix B to help determine the likelihood that any real change has occurred.

The institutional population for this study is the same as that used for the earlier Panel study. Seven percent of the institutions are universities, and the rest are nearly evenly divided between four-year and two-year colleges (see detailed table 1).[4] English is taught at nearly all institutions, whereas philosophy is taught at only two-thirds. This picture varies according to type of institutional setting. Nearly all universities offer full-time instruction in all four core humanities disciplines. In contrast, fewer than two-fifths of two-year colleges have philosophy faculty, fewer than three-fifths have modern languages faculty, and fewer than four-fifths have history faculty.

Institutional Characteristics of Faculty

The public sector accounts for two-thirds of the 58,700 humanities faculty under study. In this sector they are fairly evenly distributed among universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges (figure 1). The private sector accounts for the other third, with 2 faculty of every 3 having appointments in four-year colleges.

Disregarding type of governance, four-year colleges constitute the principal institutional setting, employing nearly 5 of every 10 core humanities faculty members. Universities employ 3 of every 10, and two-year colleges, slightly more than 2 of every 10.

Between the fall of 1979 and the fall of 1982, in terms of sheer numbers, universities experienced a

FIGURE 1

Estimates of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Institutional Setting, Fall 1982



Public (N=39,116)

Private (N=19,566)

Reference: Table 2

---

[3] We use the term core in this report to denote the total of these four humanities fields, as distinguished from the total of all humanities fields.

[4] Detailed tables are identified by number and appear at the end of the report, beginning on page 00. Text tables are identified by letter and appear throughout the report.

net gain in humanities faculty of nearly 6 percent, while four-year and two-year colleges experienced slight net losses (table A).

TABLE A—Distribution of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Institution Setting

	Number in Fall 1979	Number in Fall 1982	Percentage Change from Fall 1979
Universities	16,604	17,515	5.5
Four-year colleges	27,918	27,535	−1.4
Two-year colleges	14,065	13,632	−3.1

Reference: Table 36

Personal Characteristics of Faculty

The full-time humanities faculty considered in this study is predominantly male and nonminority.[5] Only 3 of every 10 faculty members are women, and fewer than 1 of every 10 a minority group member. Fewer than 5 percent are minority men; fewer than 4 percent are minority women. These representations have remained stable since 1979; however, in absolute terms, only nonminority women achieved growth in their numbers (table B).

TABLE B—Distribution of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status

	Number in Fall 1979	Number in Fall 1982	Percentage Change from Fall 1979
Minority men	2,877	2,788	−3.1
Nonminority men	38,496	37,893	−1.6
Minority women	2,081	2,064	−0.8
Nonminority women	15,132	15,950	5.4

Reference: Table 37

As shown in the following figures, faculty composition varies by institutional setting and by humanities field. Generally, with respect to institutions, the higher the level of educational offering, the lower the representation of women and minorities in that setting. For example, women account for 41 percent of the faculty at two-year colleges but for only 24 percent at universities (figure 2). Likewise, minorities make up 11 percent of core humanities faculties at two-year colleges and 7 percent of humanities faculties at universities. The percentages in 1982 are essentially the same as in 1979.

The converse view is shown in figure 3. Proportionately more men (especially nonminority men) than women have appointments at universities (33 percent vs. 23 percent), and proportionately more women than men have appointments at two-year colleges (31 percent vs. 20 percent). From this perspective, the only change since fall 1979 of at least 3 percentage points is in the increased representation of minority men and women at universities (from 26 percent to 29 percent, and from 15 percent to 18 percent, respectively).

There are significant differences in the way faculty are distributed by discipline. Compared to all faculty combined, an above average proportion of women teach English and below average proportions of women teach history and philosophy (figure 4). Likewise, above average proportions of nonminority men teach history and below average proportions teach English. Minority faculty of both sexes, however, have substantial representation in modern languages, probably reflecting a concentration of Hispanic faculty rather than a broader presence of minorities in the discipline.

Professional and Educational Attainment

Tenure Status. Nearly three-fourths of the core humanities faculty under consideration in this survey are tenured; an additional 14 percent are untenured but in the tenure track, and the remaining 13 percent are in positions outside the tenure track (table C).

TABLE C—Tenure Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Institution Setting

(In percentages)

	Tenured	Tenure-track	Nontenure-track	Total
Total				
Fall 1982	73.1	14.2	12.8	100.0
Fall 1979	72.3	16.0	11.7	100.0
Universities				
Fall 1982	72.8	16.8	10.4	100.0
Fall 1979	72.3	18.3	9.4	100.0
Four-year colleges				
Fall 1982	76.3	14.5	9.1	100.0
Fall 1979	74.7	16.5	8.8	100.0
Two-year colleges				
Fall 1982	66.8	10.0	23.2	100.0
Fall 1979	67.8	12.2	20.0	100.0

Reference: Tables 3, 5–7, 9–11; HEP #51 tables 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19

---

[5] The term *nonminority*, as defined on the survey questionnaire, refers to persons who are *not* black, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian, or Alaskan native.

FIGURE 2

Gender and Minority Status of Humanities Faculty, by Institutional Setting, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 37

FIGURE 3

Institutional Setting of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 37

FIGURE 4

Field Distribution of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982



Reference: Tables 2, 12–15

The tenure rate is highest at four-year colleges (76 percent), followed by universities (73 percent). Two-year colleges have the lowest rate (67 percent). Each of these institution types has a higher tenure rate in the public sector than in the private (see detailed tables 4–11).

The number and proportion of core humanities faculty holding tenure have remained fairly steady between 1979 and 1982. What may have changed in some settings, albeit very slightly, is the opportunity for tenure. Faculty already in the tenure system are progressing through it—witness the 8 percent increase in the number of professors—but few new faculty are entering (table D). The number of tenure-track faculty dropped by 11 percent, while the number outside the tenure system rose by 10 percent. In each setting, the gap has generally widened—the proportion of faculty outside the tenure system has grown while the proportion not tenured but still inside the system has fallen. These figures seem to affirm the apparent reluctance of many institutions to add to their financial obligations by offering new faculty access to the tenure track.

Figures 5A and B display the tenure status of various groupings of humanities faculty. The highest tenure rate occurs among nonminority men (80 percent), and the lowest occurs among nonminority women (58 percent) and minority women (59 percent; figure 5A).

TABLE D—Distribution of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Tenure Status and Rank

	Fall 1979	Fall 1982	Percentage Change from Fall 1979
Total	58,587	58,682	0.2
Tenured	42,377	42,867	1.2
Professor	16,133	17,377	7.7
Associate professor	15,604	15,291	−2.0
All other	10,639	10,200	−4.1
Nontenured	16,209	15,809	−2.5
Tenure track	9,376	8,306	−11.4
Nontenure track	6,833	7,503	9.8

Reference: Table 38

Overall, the differences in tenure status between minorities and nonminorities are not as great as the differences between men and women, with 65 percent of minorities and 74 percent of nonminorities tenured, compared with 79 percent of men and 58 percent of women (figure 5B). Proportionately, more than twice as many women as men are in nontenure-track positions (21 percent vs. 9 percent), whereas

FIGURE 5A
Tenure Status of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 3

FIGURE 5B
Tenure Status of Humanities Faculty, by Gender and by Minority Status, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 3

the proportions are the same for minorities and nonminorities (13 percent each).

Rank. Over the three-year period between surveys, within each of the different groupings, the proportion of tenured faculty who were full professors tended either to remain stable or to increase slightly.

The differences in tenure rates among faculty groups are generally reflected in rank. Nearly half of tenured nonminority men are full professors, compared with one-third of minority men, one-fourth of nonminority women, and one-fifth of minority women (figure 6A).

Again, gender differences tend to be greater than minority-nonminority differences. The proportion of men holding full professorships is about three-fourths greater than that of women, while the proportion of nonminorities holding full professorships is two-fifths greater than that of minorities (figure 6B).

Highest Earned Degree. Two-thirds of the faculty identified in this survey hold a doctorate degree in a humanities field. This represents a modest increase since 1979 in both the number and the proportion, more so in the private than the public sector (table E).

Although the proportion of doctorate holders at universities has barely changed, the number has increased by 7 percent. At two-year colleges, there was no change in either the proportion or number of Ph.D. holders.

Generally, relatively more men than women, and more nonminorities than minorities, hold a humanities doctorate. Almost three-fourths of nonminority men have the Ph.D., as do three-fifths of minority men, half of nonminority women, and two-fifths of minority women (figure 7). Although the proportions vary, this ordering persists in four-year and two-year colleges. At the universities, however,

TABLE E—Percentage of Full-time Humanities Faculty Holding a Humanities Doctorate

	1982	1979	Percentage Change in Number from 1979
Total	66	64	4.4
Public	61	60	2.2
Private	76	72	8.2
Universities	88	87	6.9
Four-year colleges	75	72	3.3
Two-year colleges	20	20	−0.1

Reference: Table 42

FIGURE 6A

Tenured Humanities Faculty Who Are Full Professors, by Gender and Minority Status



Reference: Tables 38–39

FIGURE 6B

Tenured Humanities Faculty Who Are Full Professors, by Gender and by Minority Status



Reference: Tables 38–39

FIGURE 7

Percentage of Humanities Faculty with a Humanities Doctorate, by Gender and Minority Status



Reference: Table 16, HEP #51 table 29

about the same proportion of nonminority and minority women have the Ph.D. (see detailed tables 18–24).

Since 1979, the levels of faculty holding a humanities doctorate have increased or at least held steady for most groups in most settings.

Together with the variations among disciplines described below, the existence or absence of the doctorate helps explain the differences in tenure rates and the proportions holding full professorships.

New Appointments

Of the core humanities faculty teaching in academic year 1982–83, approximately 3,400, or 6 percent, were newly appointed that year. Two-fifths were appointed to tenured or tenure-track positions. While the number of total faculty was essentially unchanged, the number of new appointments fell from the 1979–80 level (by 7 percent), as did the proportion of new appointments made in the tenure track (by 5 percentage points; figure 8).

Respondents to each Panel survey expected 12 percent fewer new appointments in the year following the survey year. But both sets of respondents expected the proportion of appointments in the tenure track to rise to 50 percent.

Discipline Highlights

English. There were 28,300 faculty teaching English in fall 1982 (table F). This is the largest of the four disciplines surveyed, having two to five times as many faculty as the others, depending on institutional setting. While the number teaching English has held stable over the past three years, new faculty appointments during 1982–83 declined by 17 percent (table G) and were expected to be an additional 10 percent lower the next year. The share of new appointments that were within the tenure track decreased slightly over the period.

Most English faculty (44 percent) teach in four-year colleges, but—compared with the distribution of faculty among the three remaining core disciplines—they are more likely to teach in two-year colleges and less likely to teach in universities (figure 9).

The representation of minorities and women within the field has not changed since 1979: seven percent of English faculty are minorities, and 38 percent are women. In fact, English, along with modern languages, has the largest proportion of women in its ranks—about three times that in philosophy and twice that in history (figure 10).

Seven of every 10 English faculty members are tenured, the same as three years ago. This proportion is similar to that in the modern languages but less than that in history or philosophy (figure 11). These differences among the disciplines are probably a function of three factors: (1) a large number of English faculty are women, who are less likely to hold tenure than men; (2) a smaller proportion of their number hold a doctorate degree in the humanities—only 56 percent, compared with 70–84 percent of faculty in the other three disciplines (figure 12); and (3) a larger share of English faculty teach in two-year colleges, close to two-fifths of which do not have tenure systems and three-fifths of which do not use faculty rankings. Likewise, tenured English faculty hold the rank of full professor less frequently than do the faculty in the other disciplines (figure 13).

History. There were 13,200 history faculty in fall 1982, a slight drop from three years earlier (table F). Yet, the number of new appointments made in 1982–83 was 11 percent higher than during 1979–80. Moreover, the proportion of new appointments that were made in the tenure track increased slightly, to just over one-half, whereas that proportion decreased in the other three disciplines to fewer than 40 percent of appointees in 1982–83 (table G).

TABLE F—Full-time Humanities Faculty by Discipline

	Number in Fall 1979	Number in Fall 1982	Percentage Change from Fall 1979
English	28,076	28,267	0.7
History	13,613	13,159	−3.3
Modern languages	11,009	11,552	4.9
Philosophy	5,889	5,704	−3.1

Reference: Table 35

The distribution of history faculty reflects a slight growth in the share of faculty teaching in universities since 1979. Of every 10 history faculty members, 5 teach in four-year colleges, 3 are in universities, and 2 are in two-year colleges (figure 9).

Like the others, the history faculty is predominantly male and nonminority (figure 10). As was the case three years ago, they also have the highest tenure rate among the four disciplines. Fully four-fifths of history faculty hold tenure (figure 11) and, of those, half hold the rank of full professor. While the tenure rate has remained essentially unchanged, the proportion of faculty holding full professorships increased by 5 percentage points (figure 13). Not surprisingly, then, nearly 8 of every 10 history faculty members hold a humanities Ph.D., a slight increase over the 1979 rate, and a rate exceeded only by philosophy faculty (figure 12).

Modern Languages. Modern languages is the only discipline group that experienced growth in both its

FIGURE 8
Number of New Humanities Faculty Appointments, by Tenure Status



Reference: Table 34, HEP #51 table 47

FIGURE 9
Institutional Setting of Humanities Faculty, by Discipline, Fall 1982



Reference: Table 35

FIGURE 10
Gender and Minority Status of Humanities Faculty, by Discipline, Fall 1982



Reference. Tables 12–15

FIGURE 11
Percentage of Humanities Faculty Who Are Tenured, by Discipline



Reference: Tables 12–15, HEP #51 tables 21–28

FIGURE 12

Percentage of Humanities Faculty with a Humanities Doctorate, by Discipline



Reference: Table 16, HEP #51 table 29

FIGURE 13

Percentage of Tenured Humanities Faculty Who Are Full Professors, by Discipline



Reference: Tables 12–15, HEP #51 tables 21–28 faculty overall (by 5 percent; table F) and its new faculty appointments (by 22 percent; table G). However, the proportion of new appointments that were in the tenure track dropped 15 points to less than 40 percent.

Modern languages has a larger proportion of its faculty teaching in universities than the other three disciplines—40 percent vs. 24–35 percent. Only 13 percent teach in two-year colleges (figure 9).

The discipline continues to have the highest level of minority representation, its 16 percent share being 2 to 3 times the level of the others. Again, this may reflect a strong concentration of Hispanic faculty rather than a broad presence of minorities. Like English, modern languages also has a higher proportion of women (38 percent; figure 10).

The proportion of modern languages faculty holding tenure dropped very slightly (2 percent) since fall 1979 to 71 percent—the only discipline to do so (figure 11). At the same time, the proportion of faculty outside the tenure system rose slightly to 12 percent. The percentage who held full professorships also rose slightly to 38 percent (figure 13).

Seven of every 10 modern languages faculty hold a doctorate degree in a humanities field, the same level as three years ago (figure 12).

Philosophy. The philosophy faculty, numbering 5,700 in fall 1982, is the smallest of the four disciplines. This is the only discipline group that experienced a decline in both its faculty overall (by 3 percent; table F) and its new faculty appointments (by 21 percent; table G). In addition, the proportion of new appointments made in the tenure track also dropped (from 50 percent to 37 percent).

Well over half of the philosophy faculty teach at four-year colleges and more than one-third teach at universities. Only 11 percent are at two-year colleges, the lowest proportion among the four disciplines (figure 9). Since 1979, the distribution has shifted even more toward the university sector.

The representation of minorities and women among philosophy faculty has remained virtually the same as in the earlier survey. Fewer than 5 percent are minority group members, and about 12 percent are women—the lowest representation of these groups within the four disciplines surveyed (figure 10).

More than three-fourths of philosophy faculty hold tenure, reflecting a 5 percentage point increase since 1979 (figure 11). Fully 84 percent hold a doctorate degree in the humanities, representing a 6 percentage point increase since 1979 and the highest rate among the four disciplines (figure 12).

TABLE G—New Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Discipline

	1979–80		1982–83		
	Number	% Tenured or Tenure Track	Number	% Tenured or Tenure Track	% Change in Number
English	2,055	42	1,697	39	−17
History	453	47	505	51	11
Modern languages	694	54	845	39	22
Philosophy	456	50	358	37	−21

Reference: Table 41

SUMMARY

There was virtually no change in the number of core humanities faculty between fall 1979 and fall 1982, although some shifting did occur in their distribution and composition. Their number increased at universities and decreased at two-year colleges. The number teaching modern languages grew while the number teaching history and philosophy declined.

Nonminority women increased their representation while minority men decreased theirs. The number of faculty in the tenure track fell while the number outside the tenure track rose. The number of tenured full professors increased as did the number of faculty holding a humanities doctorate. New faculty appointments decreased, as did the proportion of appointments made within the tenure system.

Despite these shifts, there has been remarkable stability among the core humanities faculty overall—principally in their number, their distribution, and their tenure rate. This stability, coupled with reductions in new faculty appointments, points to shrinking employment prospects in higher education for those who aspire to humanities faculty positions.

TABLE 1. College and University Survey Population, Fall 1982

TYPE AND CONTROL OF INSTITUTION	ALL DEPARTMENTS N	ALL DEPARTMENTS %	ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS N	ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS %	HISTORY DEPARTMENTS N	HISTORY DEPARTMENTS %	MODERN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENTS N	MODERN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENTS %	PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENTS N	PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENTS %
TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	2,447	100.0	2,380	100.0	2,162	100.0	1,763	100.0	1,598	100.0
UNIVERSITIES	182	7.4	180	7.5	178	8.2	176	10.0	182	11.4
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	1,158	47.3	1,150	48.3	1,112	51.4	968	54.9	995	62.3
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	1,107	45.2	1,051	44.1	872	40.3	619	35.1	421	26.4
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	1,330	54.4	1,272	53.5	1,133	52.4	936	53.1	771	48.3
UNIVERSITIES	111	4.5	110	4.6	110	5.1	109	6.2	111	7.0
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	349	14.2	349	14.6	329	15.2	327	18.5	268	16.8
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	870	35.6	814	34.2	694	32.1	501	28.4	392	24.5
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	1,117	45.6	1,108	46.5	1,029	47.6	827	46.9	827	51.7
UNIVERSITIES	71	2.9	70	2.9	68	3.2	67	3.8	71	4.4
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	809	33.1	801	33.7	783	36.2	641	36.4	727	45.5
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	237	9.7	237	10.0	178	8.2	119	6.7	30	1.9

NOTE: Only disciplines of English and American literature, history, modern languages, and philosophy were included in the survey. Subtotals may not add exactly to totals because of weighting and rounding.

TABLE 2. Estimated Full-time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1982

TYPE AND CONTROL OF INSTITUTION	ALL DEPARTMENTS N	ALL DEPARTMENTS %	ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS N	ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS %	HISTORY DEPARTMENTS N	HISTORY DEPARTMENTS %	MODERN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENTS N	MODERN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENTS %	PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENTS N	PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENTS %
TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	58,682	100.0	28,267	100.0	13,159	100.0	11,552	100.0	5,704	100.0
UNIVERSITIES	17,515	29.8	6,912	24.5	4,019	30.5	4,598	39.8	1,986	34.8
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	27,535	46.9	12,532	44.3	6,446	49.0	5,464	47.3	3,092	54.2
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	13,632	23.2	8,823	31.2	2,695	20.5	1,489	12.9	625	11.0
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	39,116	66.7	20,207	71.5	8,663	65.8	7,160	62.0	3,087	54.1
UNIVERSITIES	12,285	20.9	5,168	18.3	2,739	20.8	3,156	27.3	1,223	21.4
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	14,473	24.7	7,046	24.9	3,496	26.6	2,663	23.1	1,269	22.2
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	12,358	21.1	7,993	28.3	2,428	18.5	1,341	11.6	595	10.4
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	19,566	33.3	8,061	28.5	4,496	34.2	4,392	38.0	2,617	45.9
UNIVERSITIES	5,230	8.9	1,745	6.2	1,280	9.7	1,442	12.5	764	13.4
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	13,062	22.3	5,487	19.4	2,950	22.4	2,801	24.3	1,824	32.0
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	1,274	2.2	630	2.9	267	2.0	148	1.3	30	0.5

TABLE 3. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Total Institutions

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY N	TOTAL FACULTY %	MEN SUBTOTAL N	MEN SUBTOTAL %	MEN MINORITY N	MEN MINORITY %	MEN NONMINORITY N	MEN NONMINORITY %	WOMEN SUBTOTAL N	WOMEN SUBTOTAL %	WOMEN MINORITY N	WOMEN MINORITY %	WOMEN NONMINORITY N	WOMEN NONMINORITY %
TOTAL FACULTY	58,682	100.0	40,580	100.0	2,788	100.0	37,893	100.0	18,014	100.0	2,064	100.0	15,950	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	17,377	29.6	14,680	36.1	676	24.2	14,004	37.0	2,689	14.9	242	11.7	2,446	15.3
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	15,291	26.1	11,410	28.0	618	22.2	10,793	28.5	3,880	21.5	349	16.9	3,532	22.1
ALL OTHER	10,200	17.4	6,237	15.3	625	22.4	5,612	14.8	3,965	22.0	622	30.1	3,343	21.0
SUBTOTAL	42,867	73.1	32,328	79.5	1,919	68.8	30,408	80.2	10,534	58.5	1,213	58.8	9,321	58.4
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	8,306	14.2	4,688	11.5	601	21.5	4,087	10.8	3,622	20.1	467	22.6	3,155	19.8
NONTENURE-TRACK	7,503	12.8	3,642	9.0	268	9.6	3,374	8.9	3,860	21.4	384	18.6	3,476	21.8
SUBTOTAL	15,809	26.9	8,330	20.5	869	31.2	7,462	19.7	7,483	41.5	851	41.2	6,631	41.6

TABLE 4. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Institutions

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	39,116	100.0	27,247	100.0	2,127	100.0	25,121	100.0	11,881	100.0	1,425	100.0	10,456	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	10,917	27.9	9,295	34.1	464	21.8	8,831	35.2	1,614	13.6	167	11.7	1,447	13.8
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	10,113	25.9	7,604	27.9	475	22.3	7,129	28.4	2,510	21.1	249	17.4	2,261	21.6
ALL OTHER	8,266	21.1	5,115	18.8	561	26.4	4,554	18.1	3,154	26.5	515	36.1	2,639	25.2
SUBTOTAL	29,296	74.9	22,013	80.8	1,499	70.5	20,514	81.7	7,278	61.3	930	65.3	6,347	60.7
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	4,465	11.4	2,570	9.4	412	19.4	2,158	8.6	1,894	15.9	253	17.7	1,642	15.7
NONTENURE-TRACK	5,350	13.7	2,648	9.7	215	10.1	2,432	9.7	2,702	22.7	242	17.0	2,460	23.5
SUBTOTAL	9,814	25.1	5,218	19.2	628	29.5	4,590	18.3	4,596	38.7	494	34.7	4,102	39.2

TABLE 5. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Universities

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	12,285	100.0	9,375	100.0	533	100.0	8,843	100.0	2,923	100.0	240	100.0	2,683	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	4,478	36.4	4,091	43.6	196	36.9	3,895	44.0	374	12.8	31	13.0	343	12.8
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	3,854	31.4	3,080	32.9	153	28.6	2,928	33.1	774	26.5	54	22.4	720	26.8
ALL OTHER	843	6.9	533	5.7	36	6.8	496	5.6	310	10.6	18	7.3	293	10.9
SUBTOTAL	9,174	74.7	7,704	82.2	385	72.3	7,319	82.8	1,458	49.9	103	42.7	1,355	50.5
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	1,753	14.3	1,073	11.4	113	21.1	960	10.9	680	23.3	83	34.4	598	22.3
NONTENURE-TRACK	1,359	11.1	583	6.2	35	6.6	548	6.2	776	26.6	55	22.9	721	26.9
SUBTOTAL	3,111	25.3	1,655	17.7	148	27.7	1,508	17.0	1,456	49.8	138	57.3	1,319	49.2

TABLE 6. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Four-year Colleges

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	14.473	100.0	10,384	100.0	818	100.0	9,566	100.0	4,089	100.0	562	100.0	3,527	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	5.010	34.6	4,171	40.2	210	25.7	3,961	41.4	844	20.6	105	18.6	739	21.0
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	4.482	31.0	3,364	32.4	224	27.3	3,140	32.8	1.118	27.3	136	24.1	982	27.8
ALL OTHER	2.123	14.7	1,282	12.3	128	15.7	1.154	12.1	843	20.6	132	23.4	712	20.2
SUBTOTAL	11.614	80.2	8,816	84.9	562	68.6	8,255	86.3	2.805	68.6	372	66.2	2,433	69.0
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	1.493	10.3	898	8.6	185	22.6	713	7.5	595	14.6	93	16.5	502	14.2
NONTENURE-TRACK	1,360	9.4	670	6.4	72	8.8	598	6.3	691	16.9	98	17.4	593	16.8
SUBTOTAL	2.853	19.7	1,568	15.1	257	31.4	1,311	13.7	1.286	31.4	190	33.8	1.096	31.1

TABLE 7. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Two-year Colleges

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	12,358	100.0	7,488	100.0	776	100.0	6,712	100.0	4,869	100.0	623	100.0	4.247	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	1.429	11.6	1,033	13.8	58	7.4	975	14.5	396	8.1	31	5.0	365	8.6
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	1.778	14.4	1.160	15.5	99	12.7	1.061	15.8	618	12.7	59	9.5	559	13.2
ALL OTHER	5.301	42.9	3.300	44.1	396	51.0	2,904	43.3	2,001	41.1	366	58.8	1.635	38.5
SUBTOTAL	8.508	68.8	5,493	73.4	552	71.2	4,941	73.6	3,016	61.9	456	73.2	2,560	60.3
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	1.219	9.9	600	8.0	115	14.8	485	7.2	619	12.7	78	12.5	542	12.8
NONTENURE-TRACK	2,631	21.3	1,396	18.6	109	14.0	1.287	19.2	1,235	25.4	89	14.3	1.146	27.0
SUBTOTAL	3.850	31.2	1,996	26.6	224	28.8	1.772	26.4	1,854	38.1	167	26.8	1.687	39.7

TABLE 8. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982
Private Institutions

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	19,566	100.0	13,433	100.0	661	100.0	12,772	100.0	6,133	100.0	639	100.0	5,494	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	6,460	33.0	5,385	40.1	212	32.1	5,173	40.5	1,075	17.5	75	11.8	999	18.2
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	5,178	26.5	3,807	28.3	143	21.7	3,664	28.7	1,371	22.3	100	15.7	1,270	23.1
ALL OTHER	1,933	9.9	1,122	8.4	65	9.8	1,058	8.3	811	13.2	107	16.7	704	12.8
SUBTOTAL	13,571	69.4	10,315	76.8	420	63.6	9,894	77.5	3,257	53.1	283	44.2	2,974	54.1
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	3,841	19.6	2,118	15.8	188	28.5	1,929	15.1	1,728	28.2	214	33.5	1,514	27.6
NONTENURE-TRACK	2,153	11.0	994	7.4	52	7.9	942	7.4	1,159	18.9	143	22.3	1,016	18.5
SUBTOTAL	5,995	30.6	3,112	23.2	241	36.4	2,871	22.5	2,886	47.1	357	55.8	2,530	46.1

TABLE 9. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982
Private Universities

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	5,230	100.0	3,958	100.0	264	100.0	3,694	100.0	1,272	100.0	142	100.0	1,131	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	2,030	38.8	1,828	46.2	76	28.7	1,752	47.4	203	15.9	16	11.2	187	16.5
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	1,268	24.2	997	25.2	70	26.4	927	25.1	271	21.3	21	14.7	250	22.1
ALL OTHER	277	5.3	189	4.8	13	5.1	176	4.8	88	6.9	6	4.3	82	7.2
SUBTOTAL	3,575	68.3	3,013	76.1	159	60.2	2,855	77.3	561	44.1	43	30.2	518	45.8
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	1,188	22.7	714	18.0	78	29.6	636	17.2	475	37.3	67	47.4	407	36.0
NONTENURE-TRACK	467	8.9	228	5.8	27	10.2	201	5.4	239	18.8	32	22.4	207	18.3
SUBTOTAL	1,656	31.7	942	23.8	105	39.8	837	22.7	714	56.1	99	69.8	615	54.4

TABLE 10. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Private Four-year Colleges

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	13,062	100.0	8,912	100.0	397	100.0	8,515	100.0	4,149	100.0	439	100.0	3,711	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	4,430	33.9	3,558	39.9	136	34.4	3,421	40.2	872	21.0	60	13.6	813	21.9
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	3,910	29.9	2,810	31.5	74	18.6	2,736	32.1	1,100	26.5	79	18.1	1,020	27.5
ALL OTHER	1,064	8.1	578	6.5	51	12.9	526	6.2	486	11.7	101	23.0	385	10.4
SUBTOTAL	9,404	72.0	6,946	77.9	262	65.8	6,684	78.5	2,458	59.2	240	54.7	2,218	59.8
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	2,505	19.2	1,345	15.1	110	27.7	1,235	14.5	1,164	28.1	147	33.5	1,017	27.4
NONTENURE-TRACK	1,153	8.8	618	6.9	26	6.4	592	7.0	535	12.9	52	11.8	483	13.0
SUBTOTAL	3,658	28.0	1,963	22.0	136	34.2	1,827	21.5	1,699	40.9	199	45.3	1,500	40.4

TABLE 11. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Private Two-year Colleges

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	1,274	100.0	563	100.0	0	100.0	563	100.0	711	100.0	†		652	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	—		0	0.0
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	—		0	0.0
ALL OTHER	593	46.5	356	63.2	0	0.0	356	63.2	237	33.3	—		237	36.4
SUBTOTAL	593	46.5	356	63.2	0	0.0	356	63.2	237	33.3	—		237	36.4
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	148	11.6	59	10.5	0	0.0	59	10.5	89	12.5	—		89	13.6
NONTENURE-TRACK	533	41.9	148	26.3	0	0.0	148	26.3	385	54.2	—		326	50.0
SUBTOTAL	681	53.5	207	36.8	0	0.0	207	36.8	474	66.7	—		415	63.6

---

† Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 12. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982
English

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	28,267	100.0	17,392	100.0	778	100.0	16,614	100.0	10,888	100.0	1,152	100.0	9,736	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	6,862	24.3	5,565	32.0	151	19.4	5,414	32.6	1,298	11.9	89	7.8	1,208	12.4
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	6,811	24.1	4,767	27.4	107	13.8	4,660	28.0	2,044	18.8	142	12.3	1,901	19.5
ALL OTHER	5,981	21.2	3,139	18.0	219	28.1	2,920	17.6	2,843	26.1	418	36.3	2,425	24.9
SUBTOTAL	19,654	69.5	13,470	77.4	477	61.3	12,993	78.2	6,184	56.8	649	56.4	5,535	56.8
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	4,146	14.7	2,077	11.9	209	26.8	1,868	11.2	2,069	19.0	278	24.1	1,791	18.4
NONTENURE-TRACK	4,467	15.8	1,843	10.6	93	11.9	1,750	10.5	2,625	24.1	225	19.5	2,400	24.6
SUBTOTAL	8,613	30.5	3,920	22.5	302	38.7	3,618	21.8	4,694	43.1	503	43.6	4,191	43.0

TABLE 13. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982
History

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	13,159	100.0	11,063	100.0	579	100.0	10,484	100.0	2,096	100.0	239	100.0	1,857	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	5,416	41.2	4,849	43.8	128	22.1	4,721	45.0	555	26.5	50	21.1	504	27.2
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	3,434	26.1	2,916	26.4	155	26.7	2,761	26.3	518	24.7	31	12.8	487	26.2
ALL OTHER	1,789	13.6	1,492	13.5	121	20.8	1,372	13.1	297	14.2	62	25.8	235	12.7
SUBTOTAL	10,639	80.9	9,257	83.7	404	69.7	8,853	84.4	1,369	65.3	143	59.8	1,227	66.1
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	1,295	9.8	884	8.0	126	21.7	758	7.2	415	19.8	46	19.3	369	19.9
NONTENURE-TRACK	1,224	9.3	902	8.2	50	8.6	852	8.1	323	15.4	50	20.9	273	14.7
SUBTOTAL	2,520	19.1	1,786	16.1	175	30.3	1,610	15.4	738	35.2	96	40.2	642	34.6

TABLE 14. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Modern Languages

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	11,552	100.0	7,186	100.0	1,215	100.0	5,971	100.0	4,366	100.0	638	100.0	3,728	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	3,087	26.7	2,315	32.2	310	25.5	2,005	33.6	772	17.7	103	16.1	670	18.0
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	3,318	28.7	2,241	31.2	315	25.9	1,927	32.3	1,076	24.7	157	24.6	919	24.7
ALL OTHER	1,819	15.7	1,062	14.8	258	21.2	804	13.5	757	17.3	137	21.4	620	16.6
SUBTOTAL	8,224	71.2	5,619	78.2	883	72.7	4,735	79.3	2,606	59.7	396	62.1	2,209	59.3
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	1,981	17.2	1,046	14.6	222	18.3	824	13.8	935	21.4	132	20.7	803	21.5
NONTENURE-TRACK	1,347	11.7	521	7.3	110	9.0	411	6.9	825	18.9	110	17.2	716	19.2
SUBTOTAL	3,328	28.8	1,568	21.8	332	27.3	1,235	20.7	1,760	40.3	242	37.9	1,518	40.7

TABLE 15. Gender and Minority Status of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Philosophy

RANK AND STATUS	TOTAL FACULTY		MEN						WOMEN					
			SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY		SUBTOTAL		MINORITY		NONMINORITY	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL FACULTY	5,704	100.0	5,039	100.0	215	100.0	4,824	100.0	665	100.0	†		629	100.0
TENURED														
PROFESSOR	2,011	35.3	1,951	38.7	86	40.3	1,865	38.7	64	9.6	—		64	10.2
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	1,728	30.3	1,486	29.5	41	19.0	1,445	30.0	242	36.4	—		223	35.5
ALL OTHER	610	10.7	544	10.8	28	13.0	516	10.7	69	10.4	—		63	10.0
SUBTOTAL	4,350	76.3	3,982	79.0	155	72.4	3,826	79.3	375	56.4	—		350	55.7
NONTENURED														
TENURE-TRACK	884	15.5	681	13.5	44	20.5	637	13.2	203	30.5	—		192	30.5
NONTENURE-TRACK	464	8.1	376	7.5	15	7.2	361	7.5	88	13.3	—		88	14.0
SUBTOTAL	1,348	23.6	1,057	21.0	59	27.6	998	20.7	291	43.8	—		280	44.5

† Less than 100 cases

TABLE 16. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Total Institutions

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0 (N= 58,682)	100.0 (N= 40,680)	100.0 (N= 2,788)	100.0 (N= 37,893)	100.0 (N= 18,014)	100.0 (N= 2,064)	100.0 (N=15,950)
DOCTORATE*	66.1	72.9	61.4	73.7	50.9	41.5	52.1
MASTER'S*	32.2	25.9	35.7	25.2	46.4	54.8	45.3
ALL OTHER	1.7	1.2	2.9	1.1	2.7	3.7	2.6
ENGLISH	100.0 (N= 28,267)	100.0 (N= 17,392)	100.0 (N= 778)	100.0 (N= 16,614)	100.0 (N= 10,888)	100.0 (N= 1,152)	100.0 (N= 9,736)
DOCTORATE*	55.5	64.4	46.3	65.3	41.3	28.6	42.7
MASTER'S*	42.3	33.8	50.9	33.0	55.8	66.8	54.5
ALL OTHER	2.2	1.8	2.8	1.7	2.9	4.5	2.7
HISTORY	100.0 (N= 13,159)	100.0 (N= 11,063)	100.0 (N= 579)	100.0 (N= 10,484)	100.0 (N= 2,096)	100.0 (N= 239)	100.0 (N= 1,857)
DOCTORATE*	77.7	79.8	68.6	80.5	66.1	57.3	67.3
MASTER'S*	22.1	19.9	30.6	19.4	33.5	40.6	32.6
ALL OTHER	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.2	0.4	2.1	0.1
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0 (N= 11,552)	100.0 (N= 7,186)	100.0 (N= 1,215)	100.0 (N= 5,971)	100.0 (N= 4,366)	100.0 (N= 638)	100.0 (N= 3,728)
DOCTORATE*	70.4	74.8	65.6	76.6	63.2	58.6	64.0
MASTER'S*	27.2	23.2	30.1	21.8	33.8	39.5	32.9
ALL OTHER	2.4	2.0	4.3	1.5	3.0	1.9	3.1
PHILOSOPHY	100.0 (N= 5,704)	100.0 (N= 5,039)	100.0 (N= 215)	100.0 (N= 4,824)	100.0 (N= 665)	†	100.0 (N= 629)
DOCTORATE*	83.5	84.0	73.5	84.5	79.4		81.6
MASTER'S*	15.3	15.4	26.5	14.9	14.4		13.2
ALL OTHER	1.2	0.6	0.0	0.6	6.2		5.2

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 17. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Public Institutions

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 39,116)	(N= 27,247)	(N= 2,127)	(N= 25,121)	(N= 11,881)	(N= 1,425)	(N=10,456)
DOCTORATE*	61.2	68.2	58.5	69.0	45.0	35.7	46.3
MASTER'S*	37.0	30.3	38.3	29.6	52.3	60.5	51.2
ALL OTHER	1.9	1.6	3.1	1.4	2.7	3.8	2.5
ENGLISH	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 20,207)	(N= 12,431)	(N= 632)	(N= 11,799)	(N= 7,788)	(N= 813)	(N= 6,975)
DOCTORATE*	50.2	59.0	43.2	59.9	36.1	25.3	37.4
MASTER'S*	47.2	38.7	53.6	37.9	60.9	71.0	59.7
ALL OTHER	2.5	2.3	3.2	2.2	3.0	3.7	3.0
HISTORY	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 8,663)	(N= 7,464)	(N= 444)	(N= 7,021)	(N= 1,198)	(N= 126)	(N= 1,072)
DOCTORATE*	74.2	76.2	66.2	76.9	61.2	43.7	63.2
MASTER'S*	25.5	23.5	32.7	22.9	38.4	52.4	36.8
ALL OTHER	0.3	0.3	1.1	0.3	0.4	4.0	0.0
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 7,160)	(N= 4,597)	(N= 912)	(N= 3,685)	(N= 2,563)	(N= 468)	(N= 2,096)
DOCTORATE*	67.5	71.7	61.0	74.4	60.0	51.7	61.8
MASTER'S*	30.1	26.0	34.4	23.9	37.5	45.5	35.7
ALL OTHER	2.3	2.3	4.6	1.7	2.5	2.8	2.4
PHILOSOPHY	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 3,087)	(N= 2,755)	(N= 139)	(N= 2,616)	(N= 332)	†	(N= 313)
DOCTORATE*	81.3	81.5	87.8	81.2	79.5		82.7
MASTER'S*	17.8	18.0	12.2	18.3	16.0		15.0
ALL OTHER	0.9	0.5	0.0	0.5	4.5		2.2

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 18. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Public Universities

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 12,285)	(N= 9,375)	(N= 533)	(N= 8,843)	(N= 2,923)	(N= 240)	(N= 2,683)
DOCTORATE*	86.8	91.4	88.7	91.6	71.6	76.3	71.2
MASTER'S*	12.2	7.8	10.3	7.7	26.2	18.3	26.9
ALL OTHER	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.8	2.2	5.4	1.9
ENGLISH	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 5,168)	(N= 3,666)	†	(N= 3,576)	(N= 1,514)	†	(N= 1,445)
DOCTORATE*	79.0	85.2		85.3	63.3		62.7
MASTER'S*	19.7	13.6		13.5	34.1		34.9
ALL OTHER	1.4	1.2		1.2	2.6		2.4
HISTORY	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 2,739)	(N= 2,444)	(N= 118)	(N= 2,326)	(N= 295)	†	(N= 271)
DOCTORATE*	98.2	98.6	98.3	98.7	94.9		95.6
MASTER'S*	1.6	1.2	0.8	1.2	4.7		4.8
ALL OTHER	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.1	0.3		0.0
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 3,156)	(N= 2,166)	(N= 285)	(N= 1,881)	(N= 990)	(N= 140)	(N= 850)
DOCTORATE*	86.4	91.6	86.3	92.4	75.2	74.3	75.3
MASTER'S*	12.3	7.6	12.3	6.9	22.6	20.7	22.9
ALL OTHER	1.3	0.8	1.4	0.7	2.2	5.0	1.8
PHILOSOPHY	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 1,223)	(N= 1,099)	†	(N= 1,059)	(N= 124)	†	(N= 116)
DOCTORATE*	94.9	95.6		95.7	88.7		90.5
MASTER'S*	4.5	3.9		3.9	10.5		8.6
ALL OTHER	0.6	0.5		0.5	0.8		0.9

***Degree was earned in the humanities.**
†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 19. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Public Four-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 14,473)	(N= 10,384)	(N= 818)	(N= 9,566)	(N= 4.089)	(N= 562)	(N= 3.527)
DOCTORATE*	73.7	78.9	75.1	79.2	60.6	48.8	62.5
MASTER'S*	23.5	18.7	21.3	18.4	36.1	49.5	33.9
ALL OTHER	2.7	2.5	3.7	2.4	3.3	1.8	3.5
ENGLISH	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 7,046)	(N= 4,567)	(N= 208)	(N= 4,359)	(N= 2,479)	(N= 313)	(N= 2,166)
DOCTORATE*	66.6	73.8	65.4	74.2	53.5	39.3	55.5
MASTER'S*	29.2	22.3	31.7	21.8	42.1	59.1	39.7
ALL OTHER	4.1	3.9	2.9	4.0	4.4	1.6	4.8
HISTORY	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 3,496)	(N= 3,037)	(N= 192)	(N= 2,845)	(N= 458)	†	(N= 401)
DOCTORATE*	85.1	85.9	76.0	86.5	80.1		83.8
MASTER'S*	14.6	13.9	21.9	13.3	19.2		16.2
ALL OTHER	0.3	0.3	2.1	0.1	0.7		0.0
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 2,663)	(N= 1,647)	(N= 338)	(N= 1.309)	(N= 1.016)	(N= 192)	(N= 824)
DOCTORATE*	69.0	71.6	75.7	70.6	64.8	62.5	65.3
MASTER'S*	27.8	24.4	18.6	25.9	33.2	36.5	32.5
ALL OTHER	3.2	3.9	5.6	3.5	2.1	1.0	2.2
PHILOSOPHY	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 1,269)	(N= 1.133)	†	(N= 1,053)	(N= 136)	(N= 0)	(N= 136)
DOCTORATE*	91.4	91.1		90.7	94.1	0.0	94.1
MASTER'S*	8.0	8.5		8.8	4.4	0.0	4.4
ALL OTHER	0.6	0.4		0.5	1.5	0.0	1.5

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 20. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Public Two-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 12,358)	(N= 7,488)	(N= 776)	(N= 6,712)	(N= 4,869)	(N= 623)	(N= 4,247)
DOCTORATE*	21.0	24.3	20.4	24.7	16.0	8.5	17.0
MASTER'S*	77.3	74.4	75.5	74.3	81.6	86.7	80.8
ALL OTHER	1.8	1.3	4.1	1.0	2.4	4.8	2.1
ENGLISH	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 7,993)	(N= 4,198)	(N= 334)	(N= 3,864)	(N= 3,795)	(N= 431)	(N= 3,364)
DOCTORATE*	17.2	20.2	19.8	20.2	13.9	7.2	14.8
MASTER'S*	80.9	78.3	76.3	78.5	83.8	88.2	83.2
ALL OTHER	1.9	1.5	3.9	1.3	2.3	4.6	2.0
HISTORY	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	†	100.0
	(N= 2,428)	(N= 1,983)	(N= 134)	(N= 1,850)	(N= 445)		(N= 400)
DOCTORATE*	31.2	33.8	23.9	34.6	19.3		20.8
MASTER'S*	68.4	65.6	76.1	64.8	80.7		79.3
ALL OTHER	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0		0.0
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 1,341)	(N= 784)	(N= 289)	(N= 495)	(N= 557)	(N= 135)	(N= 422)
DOCTORATE*	20.1	17.1	18.7	16.2	24.6	14.1	28.0
MASTER'S*	76.7	80.2	74.7	83.4	72.0	85.2	67.8
ALL OTHER	3.1	2.7	6.6	0.4	3.4	0.7	4.3
PHILOSOPHY	100.0	100.0	†	100.0	†	†	100.0
	(N= 595)	(N= 523)		(N= 504)			(N= 61)
DOCTORATE*	31.8	31.2		31.0			42.6
MASTER'S*	65.9	68.3		68.3			50.8
ALL OTHER	2.4	0.6		0.8			6.6

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 21. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Private Institutions

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 19,566)	(N= 13,433)	(N= 661)	(N= 12,772)	(N= 6,133)	(N= 639)	(N= 5,494)
DOCTORATE*	76.1	82.4	70.5	83.0	62.3	54.3	63.2
MASTER'S*	22.6	17.0	27.5	16.5	34.9	42.3	34.0
ALL OTHER	1.3	0.6	2.0	0.5	2.9	3.4	2.8
ENGLISH	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 8,061)	(N= 4,961)	(N= 146)	(N= 4,815)	(N= 3,100)	(N= 340)	(N= 2,760)
DOCTORATE*	68.8	78.0	58.9	78.5	54.2	36.5	56.4
MASTER'S*	29.9	21.6	38.4	21.1	43.2	56.8	41.6
ALL OTHER	1.3	0.4	2.7	0.4	2.6	6.8	2.1
HISTORY	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 4,496)	(N= 3,598)	(N= 136)	(N= 3,463)	(N= 898)	(N= 113)	(N= 785)
DOCTORATE*	84.4	87.3	75.7	87.7	72.7	72.6	72.9
MASTER'S*	15.5	12.7	23.5	12.2	26.9	27.4	26.9
ALL OTHER	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.3
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 4,392)	(N= 2,589)	(N= 303)	(N= 2,286)	(N= 1,802)	(N= 170)	(N= 1,632)
DOCTORATE*	75.0	80.1	79.5	80.2	67.8	77.6	66.8
MASTER'S*	22.6	18.4	17.5	18.5	28.6	22.9	29.2
ALL OTHER	2.4	1.5	3.0	1.3	3.6	0.0	4.0
PHILOSOPHY	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 2,617)	(N= 2,284)	†	(N= 2,208)	(N= 333)	†	(N= 316)
DOCTORATE*	86.0	87.0		88.4	79.3		80.4
MASTER'S*	12.4	12.3		10.9	12.9		11.4
ALL OTHER	1.6	0.7		0.7	7.8		8.2

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 22. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Private Universities

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0 (N= 5,230)	100.0 (N= 3,958)	100.0 (N= 264)	100.0 (N= 3,694)	100.0 (N= 1,272)	100.0 (N= 142)	100.0 (N= 1,131)
DOCTORATE*	91.4	93.5	85.6	94.1	84.7	77.5	85.7
MASTER'S*	7.9	5.9	12.9	5.4	13.9	21.8	12.9
ALL OTHER	0.7	0.6	1.5	0.5	1.3	0.7	1.4
ENGLISH	100.0 (N= 1,745)	100.0 (N= 1,288)	†	100.0 (N= 1,237)	100.0 (N= 456)	†	100.0 (N= 415)
DOCTORATE*	88.5	90.8		91.6	82.5		84.1
MASTER'S*	10.4	8.2		7.5	16.9		15.2
ALL OTHER	1.0	1.1		0.9	0.7		0.7
HISTORY	100.0 (N= 1,280)	100.0 (N= 1,105)	†	100.0 (N= 1,035)	100.0 (N= 174)	†	100.0 (N= 151)
DOCTORATE*	97.2	97.2		97.5	98.3		98.7
MASTER'S*	2.6	2.9		2.5	0.6		0.0
ALL OTHER	0.2	0.0		0.0	1.1		1.3
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0 (N= 1,442)	100.0 (N= 881)	100.0 (N= 115)	100.0 (N= 766)	100.0 (N= 561)	†	100.0 (N= 487)
DOCTORATE*	87.2	90.8	86.1	91.6	81.3		81.7
MASTER'S*	11.9	8.7	13.9	8.0	16.8		16.0
ALL OTHER	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.4	2.0		2.3
PHILOSOPHY	100.0 (N= 764)	100.0 (N= 683)	†	100.0 (N= 656)	†	†	†
DOCTORATE*	96.1	96.5		96.3			
MASTER'S*	3.5	3.2		3.4			
ALL OTHER	0.4	0.3		0.3			

*Degree was earned in the humanities.
†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 23. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Private Four-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 13,062)	(N= 8,912)	(N= 397)	(N= 8,515)	(N= 4,149)	(N= 439)	(N= 3,711)
DOCTORATE*	76.0	81.7	60.5	82.7	63.9	47.4	65.8
MASTER'S*	22.5	17.7	37.0	16.7	33.0	47.8	31.3
ALL OTHER	1.4	0.6	2.5	0.6	3.1	4.8	2.9
ENGLISH	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N= 5,487)	(N= 3,377)	†	(N= 3,282)	(N= 2,110)	(N= 239)	(N= 1,871)
DOCTORATE*	71.4	80.0		80.7	57.6	28.5	61.3
MASTER'S*	27.6	19.8		19.0	40.2	62.8	37.3
ALL OTHER	1.0	0.2		0.2	2.2	8.8	1.4
HISTORY	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 2,950)	(N= 2,315)	†	(N= 2,250)	(N= 635)	†	(N= 545)
DOCTORATE*	84.4	86.7		87.6	75.9		77.6
MASTER'S*	15.5	13.2		12.4	23.9		22.4
ALL OTHER	0.0	0.1		0.0	0.2		0.0
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 2,801)	(N= 1,619)	(N= 188)	(N= 1,431)	(N= 1,182)	†	(N= 1,086)
DOCTORATE*	71.8	76.9	75.5	77.1	64.7		63.7
MASTER'S*	25.0	20.9	19.7	21.2	30.6		31.2
ALL OTHER	3.2	2.2	4.8	1.7	4.7		5.1
PHILOSOPHY	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0
	(N= 1,824)	(N= 1,601)	†	(N= 1,552)	(N= 223)	†	(N= 209)
DOCTORATE*	83.2	83.0		85.1	84.3		86.6
MASTER'S*	14.7	16.2		14.1	3.6		0.5
ALL OTHER	2.1	0.7		0.8	12.1		12.9

*Degree was earned in the humanities.
†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 24. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status, Fall 1982

Private Two-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY	MEN			WOMEN		
		SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY	SUBTOTAL	MINORITY	NONMINORITY
ALL DEPARTMENTS	100.0 (N= 1,274)	100.0 (N= 563)	100.0 (N= 0)	100.0 (N= 563)	100.0 (N= 711)	†	100.0 (N= 652)
DOCTORATE*	14.0	15.8	0.0	15.8	12.5		9.0
MASTER'S*	83.8	84.2	0.0	84.2	83.4		86.3
ALL OTHER	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1		4.6
ENGLISH	100.0 (N= 830)	100.0 (N= 296)	100.0 (N= 0)	100.0 (N= 296)	100.0 (N= 533)	†	100.0 (N= 474)
DOCTORATE*	10.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7		12.4
MASTER'S*	85.7	100.0	0.0	100.0	77.9		81.2
ALL OTHER	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4		6.3
HISTORY	100.0 (N= 267)	100.0 (N= 178)	100.0 (N= 0)	100.0 (N= 178)	†	100.0 (N= 0)	†
DOCTORATE*	22.1	33.1	0.0	33.1		0.0	
MASTER'S*	77.5	66.9	0.0	66.9		0.0	
ALL OTHER	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	
MODERN LANGUAGES	100.0 (N= 148)	†	100.0 (N= 0)	†	†	100.0 (N= 0)	†
DOCTORATE*	20.3		0.0			0.0	
MASTER'S*	80.4		0.0			0.0	
ALL OTHER	0.0		0.0			0.0	
PHILOSOPHY	†	100.0 (N= 0)	100.0 (N= 0)	100.0 (N= 0)	†	100.0 (N= 0)	†
DOCTORATE*		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	
MASTER'S*		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	
ALL OTHER		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 25. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Total Institutions

	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	58,682	100.0	42,868	100.0	17,377	100.0	15,291	100.0	10,200	100.0	15,809	100.0
DOCTORATE*	38,900	66.3	30,625	71.4	15,902	91.5	12,059	78.9	2,664	26.1	8,274	52.3
MASTER'S*	18,932	32.3	11,767	27.4	1,356	7.8	3,061	20.0	7,350	72.1	7,165	45.3
ALL OTHER	850	1.4	476	1.1	119	0.7	171	1.1	186	1.8	370	2.3
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	28,267	100.0	19,654	100.0	6,862	100.0	6,811	100.0	5,981	100.0	8,613	100.0
DOCTORATE*	15,770	55.8	12,064	61.4	5,952	86.7	4,988	73.2	1,124	18.8	3,706	43.0
MASTER'S*	11,996	42.4	7,262	36.9	822	12.0	1,713	25.2	4,727	79.0	4,734	55.0
ALL OTHER	501	1.8	328	1.7	88	1.3	110	1.6	130	2.2	173	2.0
HISTORY												
TOTAL	13,159	100.0	10,639	100.0	5,416	100.0	3,434	100.0	1,789	100.0	2,519	100.0
DOCTORATE*	10,218	77.7	8,678	81.6	5,141	94.9	2,878	83.8	659	36.8	1,541	61.2
MASTER'S*	2,909	22.1	1,941	18.2	270	5.0	545	15.9	1,126	62.9	968	38.4
ALL OTHER	32	0.2	20	0.2	5	0.1	11	0.3	4	0.2	10	0.4
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	11,552	100.0	8,224	100.0	3,087	100.0	3,318	100.0	1,819	100.0	3,328	100.0
DOCTORATE*	8,151	70.6	6,178	75.1	2,883	93.4	2,692	81.1	603	33.2	1,973	59.3
MASTER'S*	3,155	27.3	1,949	23.7	184	6.0	594	17.9	1,171	64.4	1,206	36.2
ALL OTHER	246	2.1	97	1.2	20	0.6	32	1.0	45	2.5	149	4.5
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	5,704	100.0	4,349	100.0	2,011	100.0	1,728	100.0	610	100.0	1,348	100.0
DOCTORATE*	4,761	83.5	3,707	85.2	1,926	95.8	1,502	86.9	279	45.7	1,055	78.3
MASTER'S*	872	15.3	615	14.1	81	4.0	209	12.1	325	53.3	257	19.1
ALL OTHER	71	1.2	27	0.6	4	0.2	17	1.0	6	1.0	36	2.7

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

TABLE 26. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Institutions

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	39,116	100.0	29,296	100.0	10,917	100.0	10,113	100.0	8,266	100.0	9,815	100.0
DOCTORATE*	23,996	61.3	19,404	66.2	9,742	89.2	7,617	75.3	2,045	24.7	4,591	46.8
MASTER'S*	14,523	37.1	9,550	32.6	1,091	10.0	2,364	23.4	6,095	73.7	4,974	50.7
ALL OTHER	597	1.5	342	1.2	84	0.8	132	1.3	126	1.5	250	2.5
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	20,207	100.0	14,255	100.0	4,559	100.0	4,693	100.0	5,003	100.0	5,952	100.0
DOCTORATE*	10,208	50.5	7,947	55.7	3,799	83.3	3,221	68.6	927	18.5	2,261	38.0
MASTER'S*	9,600	47.5	6,054	42.5	694	15.2	1,375	29.3	3,985	79.7	3,547	59.6
ALL OTHER	399	2.0	254	1.8	66	1.4	97	2.1	91	1.8	144	2.4
HISTORY												
TOTAL	8,663	100.0	7,146	100.0	3,421	100.0	2,291	100.0	1,434	100.0	1,517	100.0
DOCTORATE*	6,424	74.2	5,513	77.1	3,183	93.0	1,855	81.0	475	33.1	911	60.1
MASTER'S*	2,211	25.5	1,615	22.6	234	6.8	426	18.6	955	66.6	596	39.3
ALL OTHER	28	0.3	18	0.3	4	0.1	10	0.4	4	0.3	10	0.7
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	7,160	100.0	5,450	100.0	1,944	100.0	2,130	100.0	1,376	100.0	1,710	100.0
DOCTORATE*	4,854	67.8	3,937	72.2	1,799	92.5	1,692	79.4	446	32.4	917	53.6
MASTER'S*	2,164	30.2	1,460	26.8	135	6.9	423	19.9	902	65.6	704	41.2
ALL OTHER	142	2.0	53	1.0	10	0.5	15	0.7	28	2.0	89	5.2
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	3,087	100.0	2,445	100.0	992	100.0	1,000	100.0	453	100.0	637	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,510	81.3	2,007	82.1	961	96.9	849	84.9	197	43.5	502	78.8
MASTER'S*	548	17.8	420	17.2	28	2.8	139	13.9	253	55.8	128	20.1
ALL OTHER	29	0.9	18	0.7	3	0.3	12	1.2	3	0.7	7	1.1

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

TABLE 27. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Universities

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	12,285	100.0	9,175	100.0	4,478	100.0	3,854	100.0	843	100.0	3,112	100.0
DOCTORATE*	10,661	86.8	8,491	92.5	4,349	97.1	3,636	94.3	506	60.0	2,170	69.7
MASTER'S*	1,501	12.2	625	6.8	108	2.4	191	5.0	326	38.7	876	28.1
ALL OTHER	123	1.0	59	0.6	21	0.5	27	0.7	11	1.3	66	2.1
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	5,168	100.0	3,497	100.0	1,601	100.0	1,531	100.0	365	100.0	1,670	100.0
DOCTORATE*	4,081	79.0	3,068	87.7	1,499	93.6	1,380	90.1	189	51.8	1,014	60.7
MASTER'S*	1,016	19.7	392	11.2	88	5.5	130	8.5	174	47.7	625	37.4
ALL OTHER	71	1.4	37	1.1	14	0.9	21	1.4	2	0.5	31	1.9
HISTORY												
TOTAL	2,739	100.0	2,335	100.0	1,335	100.0	885	100.0	115	100.0	404	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,691	98.2	2,303	98.6	1,333	99.9	876	99.0	94	81.7	389	96.3
MASTER'S*	43	1.6	30	1.3	1	0.1	8	0.9	21	18.3	13	3.2
ALL OTHER	5	0.2	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.5
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	3,156	100.0	2,356	100.0	1,029	100.0	1,031	100.0	296	100.0	801	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,728	86.4	2,164	91.9	1,013	98.4	985	95.5	166	56.1	564	70.4
MASTER'S*	388	12.3	181	7.7	14	1.4	44	4.3	123	41.6	208	26.0
ALL OTHER	40	1.3	11	0.5	2	0.2	2	0.2	7	2.4	29	3.6
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	1,223	100.0	985	100.0	513	100.0	406	100.0			238	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,161	94.9	958	97.3	505	98.4	395	97.3	†		204	85.7
MASTER'S*	55	4.5	24	2.4	5	1.0	10	2.5			31	13.0
ALL OTHER	7	0.6	3	0.3	3	0.6	1	0.2			3	1.3

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

† Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 28. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Four-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY N	TOTAL FACULTY %	TENURED SUBTOTAL N	TENURED SUBTOTAL %	TENURED PROFESSOR N	TENURED PROFESSOR %	TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR N	TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR %	TENURED OTHER TENURED N	TENURED OTHER TENURED %	NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK) N	NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK) %
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	14,473	100.0	11,615	100.0	5,010	100.0	4,482	100.0	2,123	100.0	2,853	100.0
DOCTORATE*	10,725	74.1	9,075	78.1	4,766	95.1	3,583	79.9	726	34.2	1,649	57.8
MASTER'S*	3,469	24.0	2,385	20.5	201	4.0	834	18.6	1,350	63.6	1,084	38.0
ALL OTHER	279	1.9	155	1.3	43	0.9	65	1.5	47	2.2	120	4.2
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	7,046	100.0	5,484	100.0	2,164	100.0	2,057	100.0	1,263	100.0	1,562	100.0
DOCTORATE*	4,752	67.4	3,991	72.8	1,997	92.3	1,628	79.1	366	29.0	760	48.7
MASTER'S*	2,118	30.1	1,372	25.0	129	6.0	381	18.5	862	68.3	746	47.8
ALL OTHER	176	2.5	121	2.2	38	1.8	48	2.3	35	2.8	56	3.6
HISTORY												
TOTAL	3,496	100.0	3,021	100.0	1,692	100.0	1,059	100.0	270	100.0	474	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,975	85.1	2,613	86.5	1,647	97.3	864	81.6	102	37.8	362	76.4
MASTER'S*	509	14.6	402	13.3	43	2.5	194	18.3	165	61.1	108	22.8
ALL OTHER	12	0.3	6	0.2	2	0.1	1	0.1	3	1.1	4	0.8
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	2,663	100.0	2,091	100.0	721	100.0	889	100.0	481	100.0	573	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,838	69.0	1,538	73.6	691	95.8	666	74.9	181	37.6	300	52.4
MASTER'S*	741	27.8	529	25.3	28	3.9	211	23.7	290	60.3	212	37.0
ALL OTHER	84	3.2	24	1.1	2	0.3	12	1.3	10	2.1	61	10.6
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	1,269	100.0	1,019	100.0	433	100.0	477	100.0	109	100.0	245	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,160	91.4	934	91.7	431	99.5	426	89.3	77	70.6	227	92.7
MASTER'S*	101	8.0	82	8.0	1	0.2	48	10.1	33	30.3	18	7.3
ALL OTHER	8	0.6	3	0.3	1	0.2	3	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

TABLE 29. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Public Two-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	12,356	100.0	8,508	100.0	1,429	100.0	1,778	100.0	5,301	100.0	3,850	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,610	21.1	1,839	21.6	628	43.9	398	22.4	813	15.3	772	20.1
MASTER'S*	9,553	77.3	6,539	76.9	782	54.7	1,338	75.3	4,419	83.4	3,014	78.3
ALL OTHER	195	1.6	130	1.5	19	1.3	42	2.4	69	1.3	64	1.7
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	7,993	100.0	5,274	100.0	794	100.0	1,104	100.0	3,376	100.0	2,720	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,376	17.2	889	16.9	303	38.2	213	19.3	373	11.0	487	17.9
MASTER'S*	6,466	80.9	4,290	81.3	477	60.1	864	78.3	2,949	87.4	2,176	80.0
ALL OTHER	151	1.9	95	1.8	14	1.8	27	2.4	54	1.6	57	2.1
HISTORY												
TOTAL	2,428	100.0	1,790	100.0	394	100.0	347	100.0	1,049	100.0	639	100.0
DOCTORATE*	758	31.2	598	33.4	204	51.8	115	33.1	279	26.6	160	25.0
MASTER'S*	1,660	68.4	1,185	66.2	190	48.2	225	64.8	770	73.4	475	74.3
ALL OTHER	10	0.4	7	0.4	0	0.0	7	2.0	0	0.0	4	0.6
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	1,341	100.0	1,004	100.0	195	100.0	210	100.0	599	100.0	337	100.0
DOCTORATE*	288	21.5	235	23.4	95	48.7	42	20.0	98	16.4	53	15.7
MASTER'S*	1,035	77.2	751	74.8	94	48.2	168	80.0	489	81.6	284	84.3
ALL OTHER	18	1.3	18	1.8	6	3.1	0	0.0	12	2.0	0	0.0
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	595	100.0	442	100.0			117	100.0	278	100.0	154	100.0
DOCTORATE*	189	31.8	117	26.5	†		28	23.9	63	22.7	72	46.8
MASTER'S*	392	65.9	313	70.8			81	69.2	211	75.9	79	51.3
ALL OTHER	14	2.4	12	2.7			8	6.8	4	1.4	3	1.9

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 30. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Private Institutions

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	19,566	100.0	13,571	100.0	6,460	100.0	5,178	100.0	1,933	100.0	5,994	100.0
DOCTORATE*	14,904	76.2	11,221	82.7	6,160	95.4	4,442	85.8	619	32.0	3,683	61.4
MASTER'S*	4,409	22.5	2,217	16.3	265	4.1	697	13.5	1,255	64.9	2,191	36.6
ALL OTHER	253	1.3	133	1.0	35	0.5	39	0.8	59	3.1	120	2.0
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	8,061	100.0	5,399	100.0	2,303	100.0	2,118	100.0	978	100.0	2,662	100.0
DOCTORATE*	5,561	69.0	4,117	76.3	2,154	93.5	1,767	83.4	196	20.0	1,445	54.3
MASTER'S*	2,396	29.7	1,209	22.4	128	5.6	338	16.0	743	76.0	1,187	44.6
ALL OTHER	104	1.3	73	1.4	21	0.9	13	0.6	39	[illegible].0	30	1.1
HISTORY												
TOTAL	4,496	100.0	3,493	100.0	1,995	100.0	1,143	100.0	355	100.0	1,004	100.0
DOCTORATE*	3,795	84.4	3,165	90.6	1,958	98.1	1,023	89.5	184	51.8	630	62.7
MASTER'S*	698	15.5	326	9.3	36	1.8	119	10.4	171	48.2	372	37.1
ALL OTHER	3	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	4,392	100.0	2,774	100.0	1,143	100.0	1,188	100.0	443	100.0	1,617	100.0
DOCTORATE*	3,296	75.0	2,240	80.7	1,084	94.8	999	84.1	157	35.4	1,056	65.3
MASTER'S*	991	22.6	488	17.6	48	4.2	171	14.4	269	60.7	502	31.0
ALL OTHER	105	2.4	46	1.7	11	1.0	18	1.5	17	3.8	59	3.6
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	2,617	100.0	1,906	100.0	1,019	100.0	729	100.0	158	100.0	712	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,251	86.0	1,699	89.1	965	94.7	653	89.6	81	51.3	552	77.5
MASTER'S*	324	12.4	195	10.2	53	5.2	70	9.6	72	45.6	130	18.3
ALL OTHER	42	1.6	12	0.6	1	0.1	6	0.8	5	3.2	30	4.2

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

TABLE 31. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Private Universities

	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	5,230	100.0	3,575	100.0	2,030	100.0	1,268	100.0	277	100.0	1,655	100.0
DOCTORATE*	4,779	91.4	3,366	94.2	1,974	97.2	1,216	95.9	176	63.5	1,413	85.4
MASTER'S*	412	7.9	180	5.0	41	2.0	43	3.4	96	34.7	232	14.0
ALL OTHER	39	0.7	29	0.8	15	0.7	9	0.7	5	1.8	10	0.6
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	1,745	100.0	1,170	100.0	665	100.0	405	100.0	100	100.0	574	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,543	88.4	1,068	91.3	630	94.7	382	94.3	56	56.0	476	82.9
MASTER'S*	182	10.4	86	7.4	24	3.6	21	5.2	41	41.0	95	16.6
ALL OTHER	20	1.1	16	1.4	11	1.7	2	0.5	3	3.0	3	0.5
HISTORY												
TOTAL	1,280	100.0	981	100.0	603	100.0	339	100.0			299	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,244	97.2	963	98.2	598	99.2	334	98.5	†		282	94.3
MASTER'S*	33	2.6	18	1.8	5	0.8	4	1.2			16	5.4
ALL OTHER	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3			1	0.3
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	1,442	100.0	872	100.0	440	100.0	343	100.0			570	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,257	87.2	799	91.6	429	97.5	321	93.6	†		458	80.4
MASTER'S*	171	11.9	65	7.5	9	2.0	18	5.2			106	18.6
ALL OTHER	14	1.0	8	0.9	2	0.5	4	1.2			6	1.1
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	764	100.0	552	100.0	322	100.0	181	100.0			212	100.0
DOCTORATE*	734	96.1	536	97.1	317	98.4	179	98.9	†		198	93.4
MASTER'S*	27	3.5	13	2.4	4	1.2	0	0.0			15	7.1
ALL OTHER	3	0.4	3	0.5	1	0.3	2	1.1			0	0.0

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 32. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Private Four-year Colleges

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	TOTAL FACULTY		TENURED								NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
			SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	13,062	100.0	9,404	100.0	4,430	100.0	3,910	100.0	1,064	100.0	3,658	100.0
DOCTORATE*	9,947	76.2	7,765	82.6	4,186	94.5	3,225	82.5	354	33.3	2,181	59.6
MASTER'S*	2,930	22.4	1,563	16.6	223	5.0	655	16.8	685	64.4	1,367	37.4
ALL OTHER	185	1.4	76	0.8	21	0.5	30	0.8	25	2.3	110	3.0
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	5,487	100.0	3,814	100.0	1,638	100.0	1,713	100.0	463	100.0	1,672	100.0
DOCTORATE*	3,929	71.6	3,049	79.9	1,524	93.0	1,385	80.9	140	30.2	880	52.6
MASTER'S*	1,503	27.4	737	19.3	104	6.3	317	18.5	316	68.3	766	45.8
ALL OTHER	55	1.0	28	0.7	10	0.6	11	0.6	7	1.5	26	1.6
HISTORY												
TOTAL	2,950	100.0	2,394	100.0	1,392	100.0	804	100.0	198	100.0	556	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,491	84.4	2,142	89.5	1,360	97.7	688	85.6	94	47.5	348	62.6
MASTER'S*	458	15.5	249	10.4	31	2.2	115	14.3	103	52.0	208	37.4
ALL OTHER	1	0.0	3	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.5	0	0.0
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	2,801	100.0	1,842	100.0	703	100.0	845	100.0	294	100.0	959	100.0
DOCTORATE*	2,010	71.8	1,412	76.7	655	93.2	679	80.4	78	26.5	599	62.5
MASTER'S*	701	25.0	395	21.4	40	5.7	153	18.1	202	68.7	307	32.0
ALL OTHER	90	3.2	35	1.9	8	1.1	13	1.5	14	4.8	53	5.5
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL	1,824	100.0	1,354	100.0	697	100.0	548	100.0	109	100.0	470	100.0
DOCTORATE*	1,517	83.2	1,162	85.8	648	93.0	473	86.3	41	37.6	355	75.5
MASTER'S*	268	14.7	183	13.5	49	7.0	70	12.8	64	58.7	85	18.1
ALL OTHER	39	2.1	9	0.7	0	0.0	5	0.9	4	3.7	30	6.4

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

TABLE 33. Highest Degree Held in the Humanities by Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Rank and Tenure Status, Fall 1982

Private Two-year Colleges

			TENURED									
	TOTAL FACULTY		SUBTOTAL		PROFESSOR		ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR		OTHER TENURED		NONTENURED (TENURE-TRACK & NONTENURE-TRACK)	
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL DEPARTMENTS												
TOTAL	1,274	100.0	593	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	593	100.0	681	100.0
DOCTORATE*	178	14.0	89	15.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	89	15.0	89	13.1
MASTER'S*	1,067	83.8	474	79.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	474	79.9	593	87.1
ALL OTHER	29	2.3	30	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	5.1	0	0.0
ENGLISH												
TOTAL	830	100.0	415	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	415	100.0	415	100.0
DOCTORATE*	89	10.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	89	21.4
MASTER'S*	711	85.7	385	92.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	365	92.8	326	78.6
ALL OTHER	30	3.6	30	7.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	7.2	0	0.0
HISTORY												
TOTAL	267	100.0	119	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	119	100.0	149	100.0
DOCTORATE*	59	22.1	59	49.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	49.6	0	0.0
MASTER'S*	207	77.5	59	49.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	49.6	148	99.3
ALL OTHER	1	0.4	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	1	0.7
MODERN LANGUAGES												
TOTAL	148	100.0			0	100.0	0	100.0				
DOCTORATE*	30	20.3	†		0	0.0	0	0.0	†		†	
MASTER'S*	119	80.4			0	0.0	0	0.0				
ALL OTHER	0	0.0			0	0.0	0	0.0				
PHILOSOPHY												
TOTAL			0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0		
DOCTORATE*	†		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	†	
MASTER'S*			0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
ALL OTHER			0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		

*Degree was earned in the humanities.

†Less than 100 cases.

TABLE 34. Percentage Distribution of Full-time Humanities Faculty Hired for AY 1982-83 and Expected to be Hired for AY 1983-84, by Tenure Status and by Type and Control of Institution

	1982-83				1983-84			
	TOTAL		TENURED OR IN	NOT IN	TOTAL		TENURED OR IN	NOT IN
TYPE AND CONTROL	N	%	TENURE TRACK	TENURE TRACK	N	%	TENURE TRACK	TENURE TRACK
TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	3,404	100.0	40.7	59.3	2,980	100.0	50.0	50.0
UNIVERSITIES	1,223	100.0	41.5	58.5	1,040	100.0	49.0	51.0
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	1,523	100.0	39.4	60.6	1,382	100.0	45.4	54.6
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	658	100.0	42.1	57.9	558	100.0	63.3	36.7
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	2,086	100.0	40.7	59.3	1,864	100.0	51.7	48.3
UNIVERSITIES	854	100.0	36.6	63.4	789	100.0	46.0	54.0
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	693	100.0	37.5	62.5	606	100.0	45.9	54.1
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	539	100.0	51.3	48.7	469	100.0	69.0	31.0
PRIVATE INSTITUTION	1,318	100.0	40.6	59.4	1,116	100.0	47.2	52.8
UNIVERSITIES	370	100.0	52.8	47.2	251	100.0	58.7	41.3
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	830	100.0	41.0	59.0	775	100.0	45.1	54.9
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	119	100.0	0.0	100.0	89	100.0	33.3	66.7

TABLE 35. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 of Full-time Humanities Faculty by Discipline and by Type of Institution

	1979		1982		Percent Change
English, total	28,076	100.0	28,267	100.0	0.7
Universities	6,801	24.2	6,912	24.5	1.6
Four-year colleges	12,254	43.6	12,532	44.3	2.3
Two-year colleges	9,022	32.1	8,823	31.2	-2.2
History, total	13,613	100.0	13,159	100.0	-3.3
Universities	3,824	28.1	4,019	30.5	5.1
Four-year colleges	6,933	50.9	6,446	49.0	-7.0
Two-year colleges	2,856	21.0	2,695	20.5	-5.7
Modern languages, total	11,009	100.0	11,552	100.0	4.9
Universities	4,167	37.9	4,598	39.8	10.3
Four-year colleges	5,470	49.7	5,464	47.3	-0.1
Two-year colleges	1,372	12.5	1,489	12.9	8.6
Philosophy, total	5,889	100.0	5,704	100.0	-3.1
Universities	1,813	30.8	1,986	34.8	9.6
Four-year colleges	3,261	55.4	3,092	54.2	-5.2
Two-year colleges	815	13.8	625	11.0	-23.3

TABLE 36. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and by Type and Control of Institution

	TOTAL			MEN			WOMEN		
TYPE AND CONTROL	1979	1982	% CHANGE	1979	1982	% CHANGE	1979	1982	% CHANGE
TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	58,587	58,682	0.2	41,373	40,680	-1.7	17,213	18,014	4.7
UNIVERSITIES	16,604	17,515	5.5	12,878	13,333	3.5	3,726	4,195	12.6
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	27,918	27,535	-1.4	19,801	19,296	-2.5	8,117	8,238	1.5
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	14,065	13,632	-3.1	8,694	8,051	-7.4	5,371	5,581	3.9
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	39,363	39,116	-0.6	27,922	27,247	-2.4	11,442	11,881	3.8
UNIVERSITIES	11,992	12,285	2.4	9,275	9,375	1.1	2,717	2,923	7.5
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	14,689	14,473	-1.5	10,703	10,384	-3.0	3,986	4,089	2.6
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	12,682	12,358	-2.6	7,944	7,488	-5.7	4,739	4,869	2.8
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	19,223	19,566	1.8	13,452	13,433	-0.1	5,771	6,133	6.3
UNIVERSITIES	4,612	5,230	13.4	3,604	3,958	9.8	1,008	1,272	26.2
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	13,229	13,062	-1.3	9,098	8,912	-2.0	4,131	4,149	0.4
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	1,383	1,274	-7.8	751	563	-25.0	632	711	12.5

TABLE 37. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status and by Type and Control of Institution

	MEN						WOMEN					
	MINORITY			NONMINORITY			MINORITY			NONMINORITY		
TYPE AND CONTROL	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE
TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	2,877	2,788	-3.1	38,496	37,893	-1.6	2,081	2,064	-0.8	15,132	15,950	5.4
UNIVERSITIES	736	796	8.2	12,143	12,537	3.2	320	382	19.1	3,405	3,813	12.0
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	1,319	1,216	-7.9	18,481	18,080	-2.2	1,054	1,001	-5.1	7,062	7,238	2.5
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	822	776	-5.6	7,872	7,275	-7.6	706	682	-3.5	4,665	4,899	5.0
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	2,175	2,127	-2.2	25,746	25,121	-2.4	1,520	1,425	-6.3	9,921	10,456	5.4
UNIVERSITIES	521	533	2.2	8,754	8,843	1.0	213	240	12.9	2,505	2,683	7.1
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	892	818	-8.2	9,812	9,566	-2.5	621	562	-9.5	3,364	3,527	4.8
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	763	776	1.7	7,181	6,712	-6.5	687	623	-9.3	4,052	4,247	4.8
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	702	661	-5.8	12,750	12,772	0.2	561	639	14.0	5,211	5,494	5.4
UNIVERSITIES	215	264	22.7	3,389	3,694	9.0	108	142	31.1	900	1,131	25.6
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	428	397	-7.1	8,670	8,515	-1.8	433	439	1.3	3,698	3,711	0.3
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	59	0	-100.0	691	563	-18.5	20	59	195.0	612	652	6.5

TABLE 38. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and by Tenure Status and Rank

	TOTAL			MEN			WOMEN		
TENURE STATUS AND RANK	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE
TOTAL FACULTY	58,587	58,682	0.2	41,373	40,680	-1.7	17,213	18,014	4.7
TENURED	42,377	42,867	1.2	32,260	32,328	0.2	10,117	10,534	4.1
PROFESSOR	16,133	17,377	7.7	13,661	14,680	7.5	2,473	2,689	8.7
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	15,604	15,291	-2.0	11,935	11,410	-4.4	3,669	3,880	5.8
ALL OTHER	10,639	10,200	-4.1	6,664	6,237	-6.4	3,975	3,965	-0.2
NONTENURED	16,209	15,809	-2.5	9,114	8,330	-8.6	7,096	7,483	5.4
TENURE TRACK	9,376	8,306	-11.4	5,617	4,688	-16.5	3,759	3,622	-3.7
NONTENURE-TRACK	6,833	7,503	9.8	3,497	3,642	4.2	3,337	3,860	15.7

TABLE 39. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Gender and Minority Status and by Tenure Status and Rank

	MEN						WOMEN					
	MINORITY			NONMINORITY			MINORITY			NONMINORITY		
TENURE STATUS AND RANK	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE	1979	1982	%CHANGE
TOTAL FACULTY	2,877	2,788	-3.1	38,496	37,893	-1.6	2,081	2,064	-0.8	15,132	15,950	5.4
TENURED	2,030	1,919	-5.4	30,230	30,408	0.6	1,260	1,213	-3.8	8,856	9,321	5.2
PROFESSOR	656	676	3.1	13,005	14,004	7.7	252	242	-3.8	2,221	2,446	10.2
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	738	618	-16.3	11,197	10,793	-3.6	382	349	-8.6	3,288	3,532	7.4
ALL OTHER	636	625	-1.7	6,028	5,612	-6.9	627	622	-0.8	3,348	3,343	-0.1
NONTENURED	847	869	2.5	8,266	7,462	-9.7	821	851	3.7	6,276	6,631	5.7
TENURE-TRACK	544	601	10.4	5,073	4,087	-19.4	544	467	-14.2	3,215	3,155	-1.9
NONTENURE-TRACK	304	268	-11.8	3,193	3,374	5.7	277	384	39.0	3,060	3,476	13.6

TABLE 40. Comparison Between AY 1979–80 and AY 1982–83 in the Number of New Full-time Humanities Faculty Appointments, by Type and Control of Institution

TYPE AND CONTROL	TOTAL			TENURED OR IN TENURE TRACK			NOT IN TENURE TRACK		
	1979-80	1982-83	% CHANGE	1979-80	1982-83	% CHANGE	1979-80	1982-83	% CHANGE
TOTAL INSTITUTIONS	3,658	3,404	-7.0	1,680	1,385	-17.6	1,979	2,019	2.0
UNIVERSITIES	1,286	1,223	-4.9	556	508	-8.7	730	716	-2.0
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	1,713	1,523	-11.1	828	601	-27.4	886	922	4.1
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	659	658	-0.2	296	277	-6.6	363	381	5.1
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	2,211	2,086	-5.7	954	849	-11.0	1,257	1,237	-1.6
UNIVERSITIES	886	854	-3.7	329	313	-5.1	557	541	-2.8
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	745	693	-7.0	329	260	-21.0	416	433	4.0
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	580	539	-7.0	296	277	-6.6	284	263	-7.4
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	1,447	1,318	-8.9	725	536	-26.1	722	782	8.4
UNIVERSITIES	400	370	-7.6	227	195	-14.1	173	174	0.7
FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES	968	830	-14.3	499	340	-31.9	470	489	4.2
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES	79	119	50.0	0	0	0.0	79	119	50.0

TABLE 41. Comparison Between AY 1979–80 and AY 1982–83 in the Number of New Full-time Humanities Faculty Appointments, by Discipline

	Total			Tenured or in Tenure Track			Not in Tenure Track		
	1979-80	1982-83	% Change	1979-80	1982-82	% Change	1979-80	1982-83	% Change
English	2,055	1,697	-17.4	862	664	-23.0	1,193	1,032	-13.5
History	453	505	11.4	213	258	21.1	240	247	2.8
Modern languages	694	845	21.7	377	331	-12.2	317	514	62.2
Philosophy	456	358	-21.5	228	132	-42.1	228	225	-1.2

TABLE 42. Comparison Between Fall 1979 and Fall 1982 in the Number of Full-time Humanities Faculty, by Highest Degree Held in the Humanities and by Discipline

Highest Degree Held	Total 1979	 1982	 % Change
Total	58,587	58,682	0.2
Doctorate*	37,258	38,900	4.4
Master's*	19,807	18,932	-4.4
All other	1,522	850	-44.2
English	28,076	28,267	0.7
Doctorate*	14,785	15,770	6.7
Master's*	12,341	11,996	-2.8
All other	950	501	-47.3
History	13,613	13,159	-3.3
Doctorate*	10,170	10,218	0.5
Master's*	3,237	2,909	-10.1
All other	206	32	-84.5
Modern languages	11,009	11,552	4.9
Doctorate*	7,730	8,150	5.4
Master's*	3,029	3,155	4.2
All other	250	247	-1.2
Philosophy	5,889	5,704	-3.1
Doctorate*	4,572	4,761	4.1
Master's*	1,200	872	-27.3
All other	117	71	-39.3

*In the humanities.

APPENDIX A: Survey Instrument

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
(202) 833-4757

April 20, 1983

Dear Higher Education Panel Representative:

Enclosed is Higher Education Panel survey #61, "Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1982." Sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the survey seeks basic information about full-time faculty in selected humanities fields.

The data from this survey will provide the Endowment with critical information about a significant segment of the humanities labor force--higher education faculty. In addition to being able to enumerate and describe the humanities faculty, the Endowment will acquire an improved understanding of career patterns and better knowledge of short-term labor demand. Further, the survey's findings will be directly comparable with information collected three years earlier, thus enabling the Endowment to assess any changes that may have occurred since then.

The first part of the survey (on gray paper) seeks an institution-wide count of all full-time humanities faculty and probably should be directed to either the Dean of Instruction or the Dean of Academic Affairs. As usual, however, we leave that decision to you.

The second part (on pink paper) requests specific departmental information which we expect will have to be provided at the departmental, rather than the institutional, level. Please have a separate questionnaire completed for each of the following four humanities disciplines: (1) English and American literature, (2) history, (3) modern languages (Romance, Germanic, and Slavic only), and (4) philosophy (excluding religion).

Please be assured that responses from your institution will be protected to the maximum extent permissible by law. As with all our surveys, the data you provide will be reported in summary fashion only and will not be identifiable with your insitution. This survey is authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

Please return the completed questionnaires to us by May 16, 1983. If not all questionnnaires have been completed by that date, do not delay forwarding those that have been completed. Two prepaid return envelopes have been enclosed for your convenience. If you have any problems or questions, please do not hesitate to telephone us collect at (202)833-4757.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Atelsek

Frank J. Atelsek
Panel Director

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
(202) 833-4757

April 20, 1983

Dear Colleague:

Attached is Higher Education Panel survey #61, "Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1982." Sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the survey seeks basic information about full-time faculty in selected humanities fields.

The data from this survey will provide the Endowment with critical information about a significant segment of the humanities labor force—higher education faculty. In addition to being able to enumerate and describe the humanities faculty, the Endowment will acquire an improved understanding of career patterns and better knowledge of short-term labor demand. Further, the survey's findings will be directly comparable with information collected three years earlier, thus enabling the Endowment to assess any changes that may have occurred since then.

Unlike most Panel surveys, it is expected that this information will have to be provided at the departmental, rather than the institutional level. *Please make sure that a separate questionnaire is completed for each of the four humanities disciplines specified.*

Be assured that responses from your institution will be protected to the maximum extent permissible by law. As with all our surveys, the data you provide will be reported in summary fashion only and will not be identifiable with your institution. This survey is authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results comprehensive, reliable, and timely.

Please forward the completed questionnaire to your HEP representative (the person who provided you with the survey instrument) in time to be returned to us by *May 16, 1983*. If you have any problems or questions, please do not hesitate to telephone us collect at (202) 833-4757.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Atelsek

Frank J. Atelsek
Panel Director

INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

This questionnaire should be completed for each of the four following humanities disciplines only:

(1) English and American literature: Include comparative literature, writing, or other programs within the English department; exclude journalism, classics, or other related programs if they are *not* part of the English department.

(2) History

(3) Modern languages: Include Romance (French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese), Germanic, and Slavic *only*. Where modern languages are divided among more than one department, please include all departments that cover Romance, Germanic, and Slavic languages.

(4) Philosophy: Exclude religion.

At institutions organized by "humanities" divisions or "social sciences" divisions, faculty should be counted *only* if more than half of their teaching assignments fall into one of the four disciplines listed above.

Please forward the completed questionnaire to your HEP representative in time to be returned by *May 16, 1983*, to the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education.

If there are any questions or problems, please call the Panel staff collect at (202) 833-4757.

AMERICAN
COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION

OMB No. 3145-0009
Exp. 6/30/84

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL SURVEY NO. 61

CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME HUMANITIES FACULTY, FALL 1982

Department (or Discipline): ____________________

A. Please indicate below the number of full-time faculty in your department as of fall 1982, according to their gender, minority status, and rank. Be sure to exclude faculty who may be visiting your institution but who have permanent appointments elsewhere; count them in Item B below.

"Minority" includes Blacks, Hispanics, Asian or Pacific Islanders, American Indians, or Alaskan Natives.

If your institution has *no tenure system*, report all faculty in column (1) only.

If your institution has a tenure system but *faculty are unranked*, use columns 1,4,5, and 6 as appropriate.

	TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY	TENURED FACULTY			NONTENURED FACULTY	
	(Sum of columns 2 thru 6) (1)	Professor (2)	Associate Professor (3)	All Other & Unranked (4)	In Tenure Track (5)	Not in Tenure Track (6)
MEN						
Minority						
Nonminority						
WOMEN						
Minority						
Nonminority						
TOTAL						

	Tenured or in Tenure Track	Not in Tenure Track
B. How many new full-time faculty members were hired in your department for the current (1982–83) academic year?		
How many new full-time faculty members do you anticipate hiring for your department for the coming (1983–84) academic year?		

"Not in tenure track" includes visiting and temporary faculty on one-year or multi-year terminal contracts, as well as faculty supported entirely on soft money. If your institution has no tenure system, report all new faculty here.

C. Please indicate below the *highest advanced degree* held in the humanities by the full-time faculty in your department as of fall 1982. Count each person only once:

1. according to gender and minority status:

> For this survey, "earned doctorate" includes D.Phil., D.A., or Ph.D., but does not include Ed.D.
>
> Exclude faculty whose highest earned degree is a professional degree or degree below the Master's.

	Master's in the Humanities	**Earned Doctorate in the Humanities**
MEN		
(a) Minority		
(b) Nonminority		
WOMEN		
(c) Minority		
(d) Nonminority		
(e) TOTAL		

2. according to rank:

	Master's in the Humanities	**Earned Doctorate in the Humanities**
TENURED		
(a) Professor		
(b) Associate professor		
(c) All other tenured and unranked		
NOT TENURED		
(d) Tenure-track and nontenure-track		
(e) TOTAL		

> If your institution has a tenure system but *faculty are unranked*, use lines (c), (d), and (e) as appropriate.

> If your institution has *no tenure system*, report all faculty on line (e).

BE CAREFUL TO REPORT CONSISTENTLY BETWEEN ITEM A AND ITEM C.

Thank you for your assistance.

Please return this form before May 16, 1983, to your HEP representative or to:

Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Please keep a copy of this survey for your records.

Person completing form:

Name ____________________

Dept. ____________________

Phone (   ) ____________________

If you have any questions or problems, please call the HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757.

AMERICAN
COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION

OMB #3145-0009
Exp. 6/30/84

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL SURVEY NO. 61:

FULL-TIME HUMANITIES FACULTY

1. How may full-time humanities faculty were employed at your institution during each of the following academic years?

Academic Year	Number of Full-Time Humanities Faculty
1980–81	______________
1981–82	______________
1982–83	______________

FULL-TIME HUMANITIES FACULTY:

Be sure to include all persons with faculty rank **even if they also hold administrative positions.** Exclude visiting or temporary faculty.

If full-time faculty members are assigned only part-time to the humanities, count them only if at least half of their teaching assignments are in the humanities.

HUMANITIES:

For the purposes of this survey, humanities includes languages, both modern and classical; linguistics; English; literature; history; American studies; philosophy; archaeology; religious studies; and the history, criticism, and theory of the arts.

2. Please check the appropriate boxes below:

	Yes	No
a. Does your institution have a tenure system?	☐	☐
b. Does your institution use faculty ranks (e.g., professor, associate professor)?	☐	☐

Thank you for your assistance.

Please return this form by *May 16, 1983*, to:

Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Please keep a copy of this form for your records.

Person completing form:

Name ______________________________

Dept. ______________________________

Tel. (   ) ______________________________

If you have any questions or problems, please call the HEP staff collect at (202) 833-4757.

APPENDIX B: Technical Notes

Responses from 504 Panel institutions (three-fourths of those surveyed) were statistically adjusted to represent the population of institutions with full-time humanities faculty. The stratification design for weighting departmental data is shown below in table B-1.

The departmental structure of Panel institutions was assumed to be similar to that of all institutions. Thus, the weighting procedure first adjusted for departmental nonresponse, then for institutional nonresponse. Finally, institutional weights brought the Panel up to the national population.

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Respondent institutions are compared with Panel nonrespondents against several characteristics in table B-2. Generally, larger institutions were more likely to respond than smaller institutions. Higher-than-average response rates were recorded for universities (82 percent) and institutions in the Midwest (81 percent). Lower-than-average response rates were recorded for two-year colleges (64 percent), particularly those in the private sector (50 percent), institutions in the West (68 percent), and institutions with fewer than 2,000 undergraduates (69 percent).

Reliability of Survey Estimates

Since the statistics presented in this report are based on a sample, they will differ somewhat from the figures which would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same survey instrument, instructions, and procedures. As in any survey, the results are also subject to reporting and processing errors and errors due to nonresponse. To the extent possible, these types of errors were kept to a minimum by methods built into the survey procedures.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability; that is, the variations that might occur by chance because only a sample of the institutions is surveyed. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample would differ from a complete census by less than the standard error. The chances are about 90 out of 100 that it would be less than 1.96 times the standard error; and about 99 out of 100 that it would be less than 2.5 times as large. Thus, knowing the standard error permits us to specify a range within which we can have a stated confidence that a given estimate would lie if a complete census, rather than a sample survey, had been conducted. As an example, please refer to the estimated number of full-time faculty in English departments in all institutions—28,267. The standard error of the estimate is 539 which, when multiplied by 1.65, yields 890, or the half-length of the 90 percent confidence interval. Thus, chances are about 90 out of 100 that a complete census would show the number of full-time English faculty in all institutions to be more than 27,377 and less than 29,157.

Tables B-3 through B-5 show 90 percent confidence intervals of selected survey estimates.

TABLE B-1: Stratification Design

Cell	Category	Population (N = 2,447)	Respondents (N = 504)
01	Public universities	111	89
02	Private universities	71	58
04	Public black four-year colleges FTE 3,000 +	12	7
05	Public nonblack four-year colleges FTE 8,750 +	101	71
07	Private nonblack four-year colleges FTE 8,750 +	11	8
08	Public two-year colleges FTE 8,750 +	35	16
09	Public four-year colleges FTE 3,700 - 8,750	73	33
10	Public four-year colleges FTE < 3,700	163	25
11	Private four-year colleges FTE 2,000 - 8,750	115	30
12	Private four-year colleges FTE 1,000 - 2,000	240	34
13	Private four-year colleges FTE < 1,000	443	17
14	Public two-year colleges FTE 5,100 - 8,750	62	20
15	Public two-year colleges FTE 3,260 - 5,100	104	28
16	Public two-year colleges FTE 1,600 - 3,260	168	28
17	Public two-year colleges FTE < 1,600	501	32
18	Private two-year colleges	237	8

TABLE B-2: Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Characteristic	Respondents (N = 504)	Nonrespondents (N = 169)	Response Rate
Total	100.0	100.0	74.9
Control			
Public	69.3	73.9	73.6
Private	30.7	26.1	78.0
Type			
Universities	29.2	19.5	81.7
Four-year colleges	44.7	35.5	78.9
Two-year colleges	26.2	44.9	63.5
Control and Type			
Public universities	17.7	12.4	80.9
Private universities	11.5	7.1	82.9
Public four-year colleges	27.0	21.3	79.1
Private four-year colleges	17.7	14.2	78.8
Public two-year colleges	24.6	40.2	64.6
Private two-year colleges	1.6	4.7	50.0
Region			
East	24.1	29.0	72.0
Midwest	26.1	18.5	81.4
South	30.7	24.1	79.8
West	19.1	28.4	67.6
Undergraduate FTE Enrollment			
Less than 2,000	26.0	29.6	72.4
2,000–5,999	35.7	36.1	74.7
6,000–9,999	20.8	17.7	77.8
10,000 or more	17.5	16.6	75.9
Total Undergraduate Enrollment			
Less than 2,000	20.6	27.2	69.3
2,000–5,999	33.3	24.8	80.0
6,000–9,999	22.0	23.6	73.5
10,000 or more	24.0	24.3	74.7

TABLE B-3: Ninety Percent Confidence Intervals (+ or −) of Selected Survey Estimates, Fall 1982

Total Institutions

Gender and Minority Status	Total Full-time Faculty	Tenured Faculty			Nontenured Faculty	
		Professor	Associate Professor	All Other & Unranked	In Tenure Track	Not in Tenure Track
			Total Disciplines			
Men						
Minority	257	91	68	114	112	58
Nonminority	882	472	416	408	300	366
Women						
Minority	288	57	75	132	115	115
Nonminority	667	215	248	316	332	402
Total	1,172	515	532	645	542	654
			English			
Men						
Minority	129	29	28	83	67	32
Nonminority	631	327	279	287	231	247
Women						
Minority	255	28	47	114	109	104
Nonminority	505	142	190	296	254	344
Total	890	362	384	540	438	539
			History			
Men						
Minority	57	19	2	31	32	18
Nonminority	400	267	182	211	84	216
Women						
Minority	95	44	12	45	13	43
Nonminority	295	113	112	64	145	152
Total	432	271	228	252	180	279
			Modern Languages			
Men						
Minority	208	69	55	70	82	44
Nonminority	395	137	203	172	139	126
Women						
Minority	91	23	56	49	31	23
Nonminority	297	114	89	88	142	136
Total	577	186	238	225	232	214
			Philosophy			
Men						
Minority	55	48	10	14	20	9
Nonminority	250	159	143	98	101	105
Women						
Minority	18	0	13	6	11	0
Nonminority	123	12	69	23	68	45
Total	247	160	163	103	128	113

TABLE B-4: Ninety Percent Confidence Intervals (+ or −) of Selected Survey Estimates, Fall 1982

Public Institutions

Gender and Minority Status	Total Full-time Faculty	Tenured Faculty			Nontenured Faculty	
		Professor	Associate Professor	All Other & Unranked	In Tenure Track	Not in Tenure Track
			Total Disciplines			
Men						
Minority	235	50	62	104	104	55
Nonminority	520	264	241	325	177	296
Women						
Minority	163	32	42	92	54	39
Nonminority	411	106	149	226	177	296
Total	838	326	334	515	358	534
			English			
Men						
Minority	116	19	27	72	62	31
Nonminority	402	193	188	254	143	216
Women						
Minority	146	26	30	77	51	33
Nonminority	361	83	127	209	153	271
Total	690	246	270	435	304	460
			History			
Men						
Minority	49	13	26	31	25	14
Nonminority	255	146	113	167	63	166
Women						
Minority	25	12	12	15	12	8
Nonminority	143	36	42	63	41	95
Total	317	160	139	213	97	215
			Modern Languages			
Men						
Minority	196	43	48	68	77	42
Nonminority	176	83	72	85	51	84
Women						
Minority	66	15	25	46	15	20
Nonminority	123	55	62	54	65	72
Total	333	119	119	153	135	144
			Philosophy			
Men						
Minority	27	14	10	9	20	6
Nonminority	115	68	70	78	64	81
Women						
Minority	10	0	6	6	1	0
Nonminority	56	7	22	22	48	4
Total	120	76	75	84	91	81

Table B-5: Ninety Percent Confidence Intervals (+ or −) of Selected Survey Estimates, Fall 1982

Private Institutions

		Tenured Faculty			Nontenured Faculty	
Gender and Minority Status	Total Full-time Faculty	Professor	Associate Professor	All Other & Unranked	In Tenure Track	Not in Tenure Track
			Total Disciplines			
Men						
Minority	105	75	29	46	42	20
Nonminority	712	391	339	246	242	216
Women						
Minority	237	47	62	95	101	108
Nonminority	526	187	198	222	281	272
Total	819	398	413	389	407	377
			English			
Men						
Minority	55	21	6	42	25	6
Nonminority	487	264	207	135	181	120
Women						
Minority	209	11	35	85	96	98
Nonminority	353	116	141	210	203	211
Total	563	265	273	319	315	281
			History			
Men						
Minority	29	13	12	1	21	12
Nonminority	309	224	143	129	55	138
Women						
Minority	92	42	3	42	6	42
Nonminority	258	107	104	14	139	118
Total	292	219	181	135	151	179
			Modern Languages			
Men						
Minority	69	54	25	16	27	13
Nonminority	354	110	190	150	129	94
Women						
Minority	62	17	50	6	27	12
Nonminority	271	100	64	69	126	116
Total	471	143	207	165	189	158
			Philosophy			
Men						
Minority	48	46	1	11	3	6
Nonminority	222	144	125	59	78	67
Women						
Minority	16	0	11	0	11	0
Nonminority	109	10	65	6	49	45
Total	216	141	145	60	90	78

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Faculty Research: Level of Activity and Choice of Area.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 29, January, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctorate Faculty in Selected Science and Engineering Departments, 1975 to 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 30, August, 1976

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Energy Costs and Energy Conservation Programs in Colleges and Universities: 1972-73 and 1974-75.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 31, April, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Foreign Area Research Support Within Organized Research Centers at Selected Universities, FY 1972 and 1976.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 32, December, 1976.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **College and University Services for Older Adults.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 33, February, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Production of Doctorates in the Biosciences, 1975-1980: An Experimental Forecast.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 34, November, 1977.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Composition of College and University Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 35, August, 1977.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 36, September, 1977.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **International Scientific Activities at Selected Institutions, 1975-76 and 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 37, January, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **New Full-Time Faculty 1976-77: Hiring Patterns by Field and Educational Attainment.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 38, March, 1978.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Nontenure-Track Science Personnel: Opportunities for Independent Research.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 39, September, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Scientific and Technical Cooperation with Developing Countries, 1977-78.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 40, August, 1978.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Special Programs for Female and Minority Graduate Students.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 41, November, 1978.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **The Institutional Share of Undergraduate Financial Assistance, 1976-77.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 42, May, 1979

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Young Doctoral Faculty in Science and Engineering: Trends in Composition and Research Activity.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 43, February, 1979.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Shared Use of Scientific Equipment at Colleges and Universities, Fall 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 44, November, 1979.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Newly Qualified Elementary and Secondary School Teachers, 1977-78 and 1978-79.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 45, February, 1980.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Refund Policies and Practices of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 46, February, 1980.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Expenditures for Scientific Research Equipment at Ph.D.-Granting Institutions, FY 1978.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 47, March, 1980.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Tenure Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 48, July, 1980.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Trends in Financial Indicators of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 49, April, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **An Analysis of Travel by Academic Scientists and Engineers to International Scientific Meetings in 1979-80.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 50, February, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 51, August, 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Recruitment and Retention of Full-Time Engineering Faculty, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 52, October, 1981.

Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Sabbatical and Research Leaves in Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 53, February, 1982.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Andersen, Charles J. **Undergraduate Student Credit Hours in Science, Engineering, and the Humanities, Fall 1980.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 54, June, 1982.

Andersen, Charles J. and Atelsek, Frank J. **An Assessment of College Student Housing and Physical Plant.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 55, October, 1982.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Financial Support for the Humanities: A Special Methodological Report.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 56, January, 1983.

Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. **Neuroscience Personnel and Training.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 57, June, 1983.

Atelsek, Frank J. **Student Quality in the Sciences and Engineering: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 58, February, 1984.

Andersen, Charles J. **Student Quality in the Humanities: Opinions of Senior Academic Officials.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 59, February, 1984.

Andersen, Charles J. **Financial Aid For Full-Time Undergraduates.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 60, April, 1984.